

# भारत का राजपत्र The Gazette of India

प्राधिकार से प्रकाशित  
PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

सं० 5] नई दिल्ली, शनिवार, फरवरी 3, 1968/माघ 14, 1889

No 5] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1968/MAGHA 14, 1889

इस भाग में भिन्न पृष्ठ संख्या दी जाती है जिससे कि यह अलग संकलन के रूप में रखा जा सके।

Separate paging is given to this Part in order that it may be filed as a separate compilation

नोटिस

NOTICE

नीचे लिखे भारत के असाधारण राजपत्र 17 जनवरी 1968 तक प्रकाशित किये गये :—

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published up to the 17th January, 1968.

Issue No.	No. and Date	Issued by	Subject
22	S.O. 313, dated 17th January, 1968.	Ministry of Commerce	Further amendment to the Exports (Control) Order, 1962.
23	S.O. 314, dated 17th January, 1968.	Ministry of Labour Employment & Rehabilitation	Constitution of a National Industrial Tribunal at Dhanbad and referring the dispute of the Madras Dock Labour Board and its Workers for adjudication to it.

ऊपर लिखे असाधारण राजपत्रों की प्रतियां प्रकाशन प्रबन्धक, सिविल लाइन्स, दिल्ली के नाम मागपत्र भेजने पर भेज दी जाएंगी। मागपत्र प्रबन्धक के पास इन राजपत्रों के जारी होने की तारीख से 10 दिन के भीतर पहुंच जाने चाहिए।

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes

## भाग II—खण्ड 3—उपखण्ड (ii)

## PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)

(रक्षा मंत्रालय की छोड़कर) भारत सरकार के मंत्रालयों और (संघ क्षेत्र प्रशासन की छोड़कर) केन्द्रीय प्रधिकारों द्वारा जारी किए गए विधिक आदेश और अधिसूचनाएं।

Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administration of Union Territories)

## ELECTION COMMISSION, INDIA

New Delhi, the 4th January 1968

S.O 376—In pursuance of section 106 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951, the Election Commission hereby publishes the order pronounced on the 21st December, 1967, by the High Court of Jammu and Kashmir at Jammu in Election Petition No. 2 of 1967.

## HIGH COURT OF JAMMU &amp; KASHMIR AT JAMMU

PRESENT:

The Hon'ble Mr Justice J. N. Bhat.

ELECTION PETITION NO. 2 OF 1967

Kacho Mohd. Ali Khan—*Petitioner.*

Vs.

Shri Kushok Bakula—*Respondent.*

Election Petition

Mr. Ishwar Singh.

Messrs B. R. Dhawan and S. P. Gupta.

This is an election petition under Chapter 11 of the Representation of the People Act, 1951 (hereinafter referred to as the Act) challenging the election of the respondent to the Lok Sabha, who was returned unopposed to the Parliamentary Constituency of Ladakh from the State of Jammu & Kashmir. The allegations in the Petition are that the Petitioner is an elector of the Ladakh Parliamentary Constituency and is registered as a voter under No. 387 in the Electoral Roll of village Pashkum, Patwar Halqa Pashkum of the Kargil Assembly Constituency falling within the Ladakh Parliamentary Constituency and is an elector within the meaning of the Act. The respondent paid a security deposit of Rs. 250/- whereas he had to deposit Rs. 500/- for contesting the Parliamentary Constituency. The Returning Officer at the time of scrutiny of the nomination paper of the respondent on 21st January 1967 should have rejected the nomination paper of the respondent but he improperly accepted it. By this improper acceptance of the nomination paper of the respondent, the result of the said election, in so far as it concerns the said returned candidate, has been materially affected. The further grounds taken in the petition are that the declaration of the respondent as duly elected under section 53(2) of the Act, required the respondent to lodge with the District Election Officer an account of his election expenses within 30 days from the date of his election. This the respondent has failed to do. Neither the respondent nor his election agent has kept a separate and correct account of all expenditure incurred in connection with election as required under section 77 of the Act. The respondent further took recourse to corrupt practices within the meaning of section 123, sub-section (2) and (7) of the Act. The facts and circumstances constituting corrupt practices are given in para No. 10 of the petition. It is mentioned therein that the respondent was a Minister of State for Ladakh affairs in the outgoing Ministry. The respondent exercised considerable influence over the officers in Ladakh. On the 14th of January 1967 a notice was issued in Ladakh and Kargil that the last date for filing the nomination papers for the Ladakh Parliamentary Constituency was fixed as 20th January 1967 upto 3 P.M. The entire district of Ladakh being snow-bound, the means of transport from Kargil to Leh, which is a distance of about 150 miles, is by bus only which is

owned and controlled by the Government. There was only one bus running from Kargil to Leh. The respondent as a Minister for State controlling the entire affairs of Ladakh, managed that the bus be delayed to ensure that no person from Kargil could reach Leh in time to file his nomination paper. The bus was ordinarily expected to leave Kargil for Leh on the 14th of January 1967. It was got delayed at Kargil on one pretext or other till 19th of January 1967 forenoon. Normally the bus having started on the 19th forenoon from Kargil should have reached Leh on the forenoon of 20th January 1967. The majority of electors of Kargil had decided to support the Sheikh Gulam Raza S/o Mehdi of Village Shelikche, Tehsil Kargil, who was a registered voter at serial No. 947 in the Electoral Roll for the said Assembly/Ladakh Parliamentary Constituency pertaining to Patwar Halqa Poen. The said Sheikh Gulam Raza with his proposers namely Haji Gulam Ali S/o Mussa and Gulam Ali S/o Habib Ullah Khan who were registered voters in this constituency left by this bus for the purpose of filing the nomination papers of the said Sheikh Gulam Raza. After the bus left Kargil, one Agha Syed Ibrahim Shah S/o Syed Kazim Shah managed to send a message over the telephone to the respondent at Leh intimating to him of the departure of the said three persons. This Agha had tried to avoid the departure of the said three persons but had failed. He is closely associated with the respondent, both belonging to the Congress Party. On receiving this information from the said Agha, the respondent took advantage of his position as a State Minister in charge of Ladakh affairs and his political influence sent police personnel to intercept the bus to ensure that the three persons mentioned above could not reach Leh before the scheduled time i.e. 3 P.M. on the 20th of January 1967. When the bus reached Bazgo, which is at a distance of about 26 miles from Leh, late in the evening on 19th January 1967, the said police personnel reached the spot and stopped the bus. At the instance of the said police personnel, the driver of the bus, Ghulam Mohd. Shaul conspired to delay the bus on account of some mechanical defect in the vehicle. After the said driver met the police, he came back in to the bus and taking the bus a little further pretended that the bus could not move further on account of some mechanical defect. The driver of this bus went in the jeep of the police personnel to Leh on the pretext of getting help for the bus. The said driver returned from Leh with a mechanic on the afternoon of 20th January 1967 and after pretending to have the bus repaired, proceeded towards Leh and reached Leh at 5 P.M. on 20th of January 1967 when the time for filing the nomination paper had expired. Because of these activities, the nomination papers of Sheikh Gulam Raza could not be filed. The people of Kargil felt strongly agitated on realising the game played by the respondent, and sent telegrams protesting against the said conduct of the respondent to various high dignitaries including the Dy. Commissioner, Leh, who is the District Election Officer also. As the time had expired, no action was taken and the respondent was declared elected. The election is therefore liable to be declared void, which may be done and necessary consequential orders may also be passed. An affidavit in support of the allegation of the corrupt practices has also been filed alongwith the petition.

In the objections filed by the respondent, it is stated that the petitioner has no right to present this petition. The respondent appeared before the competent authority for the deposit of Rs. 500/- but the respondent was told by the said officer to deposit only Rs. 250/- and the same was deposited. Under orders of the authority. The respondent presented Rs. 500/- as security deposit to the authority. The election has not been materially affected nor is there any mention in the petition of how the election has been materially affected. The petitioner had nowhere alleged that in case the nomination paper of the respondent was rejected, any other person would have submitted his nomination paper. The allegations as contained in paragraph 4 of the petition are vague as no details have been given. The allegations with respect to failing to file and maintain election expenses account have been denied. Further it is not shown by the petitioner as to how the non-furnishing of the election expenses accounts has materially affected the election. The respondent has not incurred any expenditure in this behalf, as he was not opposed by any candidate but was elected unopposed. In reply to para No. 10-A it is stated that all the facts except that the respondent exercised considerable influence over the Government officers in Ladakh are incorrect. The allegations of alleged corrupt practices are vague and have not been verified separately.

On these pleadings of the parties the following issues were framed on 28th May 1967:—

1. Is the Petitioner an elector in the Ladakh Parliamentary Constituency?  
O.P.P.

- 2 If issue 1 is proved, is the petitioner not competent to file this petition? O.P.D.
- 3 (a) Was the respondent directed to deposit Rs. 250/- only as security deposit by the Returning Officer? O.P.D.  
(b) If so what is its effect on the present petition? O.P.D.
4. As the respondent had been returned uncontested, was it not necessary for him to furnish any election expenses within the prescribed period of 30 days after the date of his election? O.P.D.
5. Was the bus running between Kargil and Leh detained and delayed at Kargil on one pretext or the other till 19th January 1967 FN with the manipulation of the respondent? O.P.P.
6. Were Sheikh Ghulam Raza S/o Mehdi of village Shelikhe Tehsil Kargil, a prospective candidate for this constituency, Haji Ghulam Ali S/o Musa R/o Village Khas Kargil and Ghulam Ali S/o Habib Ullah Khan R/o village Khas Kargil travelling by this bus to file the nomination papers of Sheikh Ghulam Raza on 19th January 1967 before the Returning Officer at Leh? O.P.P.
7. Was it manouvered by the respondent through the police personnel at Leh that the bus should not reach Leh before 3 P.M. on 20th January 1967? If so, how? O.P.P.
8. If issue Nos 5, 6, and 7 or anyone or more of them are proved in the affirmative has the result of the election been materially affected thereby? O.P.P.

The petitioner produced the following witnesses in support of his case.

Giresh Chander, Shri Ghulam Raza, Ghulam Mohammad Shalla, driver Bus No. 236 JKA, and the petitioner appeared as his own witness. The respondent produced Mohammad Abdulla Abas, S.H.O. Police station Leh, Chuni Lal Greaser, Govt. Transport Workshop, Leh, Ghulam Rasul Booking Manager, Transport Department, Leh, Chewang Rigzan Election Naib-Tehsildar, Shri Sonam Wangyal, Shri Giresh Chander, Tushi Rigzan, and appeared as his own witness.

In rebuttal Shri Sonam Narbo Returning Officer was examined as a witness by the petitioner on 20th October 1967. Arguments in this case were heard on 14th November 1967. After going through the file and the record, I thought necessary to re-examine Shri Sonam Narbo. He was recalled and it took him a long time to appear again and ultimately he was again re-examined on 14th December 1967. I need not deal in extense with the statements of different witnesses produced by the parties. While discussing different issues, the relevant statements of the witnesses produced by either side would be mentioned.

So far as issue No 1 is concerned, the petitioner has discharged the onus of proof of this issue. Giresh Chander who appeared twice, once as witness for the petitioner and second time as witness for the respondent, has produced the record of the Chief Election Officer and it is proved from his statement that the petitioner is a registered elector under No. 387 as appears in the Electoral roll produced, which is marked Ex. P.W 1/1. The parentage of the petitioner was corrected from Mohammad Akaber Khan to Kacho Mohd. Akbar Khan. This evidence is not rebutted by the respondent. Therefore issue No. 1 is held proved in favour of the petitioner.

#### *Issue No. 2*

Issue No. 1 has been held to be proved and in my opinion this second issue should be decided against the respondent; because the respondent has not shown anything why when the petitioner is a registered elector of the said parliamentary constituency, his petition is not competent. Under section 81 of the Act any elector can present an election petition within 45 days from the date of the election of the returned candidate. Therefore the petitioner is fully competent to present the election petition.

#### *Issue No. 3*

This issue is split in two parts (a) and (b) This is an important issue in the case. So far as the factual part of this issue is concerned, which is the subject matter of part (a) of this issue, the following witnesses have been examined. The burden of proof of this issue was upon the respondent. The respondent's

case is that he went with Rs. 500/- security money to the Returning Officer Sonam Narboo. Mr. Sonam Narboo told him the only Rs. 250/- was the requisite security deposit. On the insistence of the respondent the Returning Officer again told him that only Rs. 250/- was the amount required for the security deposit. On further insistence of the respondent the Returning Officer consulted the book and directed the respondent to deposit Rs. 250/- only as the security deposit which he did. This statement in all its details is corroborated by Tashi Rigzan who was the proposer of the respondent, Sonam Wangyal who was present at the time of presentation of this nomination paper of the respondent and even by Chewang Rigzen who was the Election Naib Tehsildar of the Constituency, working with the Returning Officer. These gentlemen further depose that on the insistence of the respondent that he would deposit Rs. 500/- as the security money which he actually placed before him, the Returning Officer consulted a book namely the Jammu and Kashmir Representation of the People Act and then impressed upon the respondent that the law required only Rs. 250/- as the security deposit. This was done by the respondent in obedience to the orders of the Returning Officer. In rebuttal the petitioner produced Mr. Sonam Narboo who states that he did not advice or direct the respondent to deposit only Rs. 250/-. The respondent had deposited the security money with the Election Naib Tehsildar Chewang Rigzan. He had no talk with the respondent about the security deposit. He relied on his Naib Tehsildar Chewang Rigzan who was an experienced man and at the time of scrutiny, he enquired of the Election Naib Tehsildar whether everything so far as the nomination paper of the respondent was concerned, was in order and on his replying in the affirmative, he accepted the nomination paper of the respondent. The respondent was the only candidate who had filed his nomination paper and therefore he was declared elected. As already stated when I went through the record of this case, I came across some papers from the election file which necessitated my re-examining this gentleman Mr. Sonam Narboo the Returning Officer. I have not the least doubt in my mind that the story as put forward by the respondent is the correct version of the episode of the deposit of the security money. This version is corroborated by the witnesses above mentioned. There is further intrinsic evidence to indicate that the version of the respondent in this behalf is correct, and that of Mr. Sonam Narboo is wrong. The amount of Rs. 250/- seems to have been paid to Mr. Sonam Narboo himself as the Returning Officer who may have given it to Chewang Rigzan Election Naib Tehsildar. On the election file there is a letter by this Returning Officer, Mr. Sonam Narboo addressed to the Treasury Officer, Leh, which has been exhibited as C-3 where by this Returning Officer sends a sum of Rs. 250/- to the Treasury Officer to be deposited as security deposit of the respondent. This letter is admitted by him and it was to prove this letter that the witness was recalled. There are further two documents on the election file, one is a telegram from the Deputy Commissioner, Ladakh, Leh to the Chief Election Officer whose telegraphic address is 'Election' at Jammu demanding the Central Representation Peoples Act because there was some controversy about the amount of the security deposit required for the parliamentary constituency. The relevant portion of this telegram is as under :-

"Under section 45 J. & K Representation People Act Deposit candidates Legislative Assembly Constituency Rupees Two hundred and fifty AAA Central Representation People Act not supplied to this office AAA kindly signal amount deposit candidates for parliamentary constituency quoting section and Act"

This telegram is the office copy of a telegram and is dated 3rd April 1967. In reply to this telegram the Chief Election Officer sends a telegram to the Deputy Commissioner Leh, which was received by him on 11th April 1967 and it recites :-

"Election manual India already posted registered vide 14399 28th January 1967 stop Vide section thirty-four Representation People Act 1951 deposits for Parliamentary election Five hundred rupees."

This document is exhibited as C2. It was to prove these three documents that I had the necessity of recalling Mr. Sonam Narboo. Mr. Mukherji, the then Deputy Commissioner Leh is stated to be some where in Calcutta whose whereabouts are not clearly indicated.

It was argued before me that the Returning Officer mala fide misinformed the respondent and directed him to deposit only Rs. 250/- as the security deposit whereas he offered more than once Rs. 500/- as security deposit. I am not prepared to go to this length. What is clear from the record is that the Returning Officer had not received the Representation of People Act of India, 1951 by the 20th

of January 1967, or even by the 21st of January 1967 when the nomination paper of the respondent was filed before him or scrutiny of the same was done. The only book that was available with the Returning Officer was the J. & K. Representation of People Act. That clearly laid down a deposit of Rs. 250/-. The Returning Officer believing that law to be applicable to the case of the respondent directed him to deposit only Rs. 250 while the respondent was pressing for depositing Rs. 500 as security deposit and had actually placed this amount before the Returning Officer. Mr Sonam Narboo had no alternative, although he is belied by his own document in this behalf, to state that he had no talk with the respondent about the security deposit. He further confessed that he did not know even upto the time he made the statement in the court what the actual amount was that was required to be deposited under the law. He had to deny the talk or even the receipt of the security deposit of Rs. 250 because otherwise he would be faced with the awkward position as to why he accepted the nomination paper of the respondent when the security deposit was not properly paid by him. Therefore my finding on part (a) of this issue is that the respondent offered Rs. 500 as the security deposit to the Returning Officer and even placed this amount before the Returning Officer but ultimately deposited only Rs. 250 with the Returning Officer on this account under the advice, and guidance and direction of the Returning Officer. The respondent has done what any other prudent man would have done under the circumstances in that far flung area where there is no legal practitioner even. The Returning Officer was the final authority on the matter. Part (b) of this issue will be discussed by me later when I discuss the legal aspect of this case.

*Issue No. 4.*—This issue is factual as well as legal. I will take up this issue after I discuss issues Nos. 5, 6 and 7 which are issues of fact. These three issues are inter-linked and they form the subject matter of the so called corrupt practices resorted to by the respondent.

*Issue No. 5.*—About this issue there is no evidence except that of Ghulam Raza who alleges that he was a prospective candidate for this election, with regard to the subject matter of this issue. We do not know whether the bus was due to leave on the 14th. No question has been put in this behalf to the driver of the Bus Ghulam Mohd Shalla who was the petitioner's witness and favourably inclined towards him. On the other hand this Ghulam Mohammad Shalla who is absolutely a false witness otherwise does not support the petitioner at all in this part of the case. According to this driver 16th and 17th of January 1967 were the days of his halt at Kargil. The bus had to leave for Leh on the 18th of January 1967 but the Manager made the bus to leave on the 19th of January, 1967 instead of 18th. Some Hajies were booked for this bus for the 19th. Therefore in view of my other remarks pertaining to this witness's statement I think this issue is, not at all proved by the petitioner.

*Issue No. 6.*—According to Ghulam Raza, Haji Ghulam Nabi and Kacho Mohammad Ali had accompanied Ghulam Raza to propose him for this constituency. Haji Ghulam Nabi has not been produced. Kacho Mohammad Ali is perhaps the petitioner but the witness clearly states that he did not accompany this Ghulam Raza to Leh. In the election petition it is stated that Ghulam Raza was accompanied by one Haji Garam Ali and another Gulam Ali. The driver Ghulam Mohd. Shalla only mentions Ghulam Raza and Haji Ghulam Ali as among others the passengers who travelled by his bus JKA 236. There are contradictory statements about the companions of Ghulam Raza travelling by this bus for the purpose of nominating this Ghulam Raza for this constituency. This story of Ghulam Raza travelling for filling his nomination paper and other incidents connected with the same appear to me to be an after thought because if it were correct this Ghulam Raza or his prospective proposer should have raised a hue and cry at any time about the malpractices committed by the respondent. According to Ghulam Raza and even Ghulam Mohammad Shalla, Ghulam Raza accompanied by other friends whatever their names, reached Leh at 5 p.m. on the 20th of January 1967. They could have taken some steps to ventilate their grievances and complained about this so called conspiracy and treatment matter

out to them. But nothing was done. On the other hand we find in the election petition para 10(f) that on realising the game played by the respondent in preventing the said persons is filing the nomination papers in opposition, the people of Kargil felt strongly agitated and immediately sent telegrams protesting against the said conduct of the respondent to various high dignitaries including the Deputy Commissioner Leh who is the District Election Officer. But nothing of the sort has been brought out in evidence and no telegrams or any other protests have been produced or even hinted at during the proceedings in this case. The maximum that can be held in favour of the petitioner so far as issue No. 6 is concerned, is that Ghulam Raza was travelling by this bus from Kargil to Leh. He has not proved at all that Ghulam Raza had gone to file the nomination paper and for that purpose was accompanied by Haji Ghulam Ali s/o Musa and Gulam Ali s/o Habib Ullah Khan.

*Issue No. 7.*—In support of this issue the only statement is that of Ghulam Mohammad Shall a driver. This driver, as I remarked earlier, is a liar and no reliance can be placed on his statement as he is contradicted in almost all the particulars brought out in his statement in favour of the petitioner. According to this witness he started with 19 passengers in his bus from Kargil to Leh on the 19th of January, 1967. By the evening of that day he reached a place near Bazghu. The Hajies who were travelling by this bus insisted that the driver should take them same day to Leh as they had to leave from there next morning for Bombay. When the bus reached Baker curve, it was dark, a jeep with lights off came in the opposite direction and when it came near the bus they asked the driver to stop. A police constable emerged from the jeep and took aside the driver. The police constable told him to stop there for the night and so that the bus reaches Leh next day at 5 p.m. That was his order. A constable was made to stay in the bus. They stayed for the night at Bazghu and there under the instructions of the Head Constable, the driver told the passengers that the bus had gone out of order and could not proceed. The constables did not permit him to go beyond Bazghu. He went by a jeep which was coming from Khalsi to Leh where he stayed for the night, met the S.H.O. and the S.H.O. told him not to reach Leh before 5 p.m. He came back to Bazghu at 2 p.m. Then he pretended to set right some wheel of the bus and then carried the passengers and reached Leh at 5 p.m. on the 20th of January 1967. The person who had detained the bus was Sikh. The constable who was made to stay in the bus, his name is Mohammad Hussain Mohammad Abdullah Abbas is S.H.O. Leh. There is department of transport also in Leh. He approached the Works Manager of the department in Leh who deputed one Chuni Lal fitter with the driver. The bus was all right but Chuni Lal also pretended to set right the bus. He opened the wheel and then refitted it. There is no other evidence to support the statement of this witness. The respondent has produced Chuni Lal Greaser in the Transport Workshop at Leh. According to this witness, Chuni Lal, this Ghulam Mohammad Shalla driver never complained that the police had detained the bus. On the other hand the driver reported that the bus had gone out of order. He was directed by the Head Mechanic to accompany the driver to Bazghu. He actually went on spot. The oil-seal of the bus was wrong. The drum of the bus was full of oil. It took Chuni Lal two hours to set right the bus. The bus was really defective. There was no policeman on spot nor did any passenger complain against the driver. The other witness of the respondent Ghulam Rasul is the Booking Manager of Leh. According to him this Ghulam Mohammad Shalla came to him and told him that his bus had gone out of order. He directed Chuni Lal to go with him. The driver never complained that the police had detained his bus. Mohammad Abdullah Abbas S.H.O. Leh also has been produced by the respondent. According to him he was S.H.O. Leh in January, 1967. Ghulam Mohammad Shalla never complained to him that his bus had been stopped by the Police Constable. There was no Sikh Constable under him in that Thanna. From these statements it is clear that the story put by the petitioner in his petition which he tried to get corroborated by Ghulam Mohammad Shalla driver is false and has been contradicted by the evidence of Chuni Lal Mohammad Abdullah Abbas and Ghulam Rasul. Further there is nothing in the evidence produced on behalf of the petitioner that the respondent has attempted to do directly or indirectly with either stopping the bus at Bazghu or influencing any police or other officers to act as suggested by the petitioner. In the total absence of any indication of any connection between the respondent and this alleged episode the petitioner has miserably failed to prove this issue No. 7.

These are my findings on issues of fact. I will now before discussing purely legal issues, take up issue No. 4 which is both an issue of fact and law. The respondent has stated that he did present the account of election expenses as required under law. Further he has stated that he incurred no expenses. There is some correspondence on the election file about the controversy relating to the

submission of accounts by the respondent. The respondent has filed an account of election expenses but it cannot be said with any amount of certainty whether he has filed the account of election expenses within the prescribed period of 30 days of the declaration of his result. But according to me that controversy is not material so far as this issue or its effect on the election petition is concerned. Section 100 of the Act mentions the grounds for declaring any election to be void. It consists of two sub-parts. The second sub-part starts with (d) non-furnishing of election expenses by itself is not a ground for invalidating the election but Clause (iv) of sub-section (d) of this section says that "by any non-compliance with the provisions of the Constitution or of this Act or of any rules or orders made under this Act an election can be held void." But this is subject to the condition that the result of the election, so far as it concerns the returned candidate was materially affected. It is argued that under section 78 of the Act it was necessary for the respondent to lodge with the District Election Officer the account of the election expenses within 30 days of his declaration as elected. That he has not done, and therefore his failure to do so is a non-compliance with the provisions of this Act. But as I said it must be shown by the petitioner that this non-compliance has materially affected the result of the election. The respondent was returned uncontested to this Parliamentary Constituency. He has stated that he has not incurred any expenses. Even if he did not file the accounts of expenses within the requisite period nothing has been shown or even suggested how the result of the election has been materially affected. This provision apart from other limitations, which shall be discussed later, has been enacted to furnish the accounts of the election expenses to the proper authorities so that it can be ascertained whether there has been any corrupt practice committed by the candidate in incurring expenses on prohibited items or in excess of the maximum prescribed under the rules. But in this case there was no contest and no expenses were actually incurred. So the result of the election could not possibly be materially affected. That is one aspect of this issue.

In my opinion this objection of the petitioner can be disposed of summarily as baseless. Section 77 of the Act enjoins upon every candidate to keep a separate and correct account of the expenditure incurred by him in connection with his election. Section 78 of the Act makes the lodging of the account of the election expenses with the District Election Officer obligatory only for the contesting candidate and not for all candidates. The word 'contesting candidate' is not separately defined in the Act but Section 38 of the Act more or less gives the definition of the word 'contesting candidates'. It says immediately after the expiry of the period within which candidatures may be withdrawn under sub-section (1) of section 37, the Returning Officer shall prepare and publish in such form and manner as may be prescribed a list of contesting candidates, that is to say candidates who were included in the list of validly nominated candidates and who have not withdrawn their candidature within the said period. The obviously means that candidates who have filed their nomination papers can be deemed to be contesting candidates only if they persist to remain as such after the date fixed for the withdrawal of the candidature. That means till that time a candidate is not deemed to be a contesting candidate. The rules 8, 10 and 11 of the Election Rules also may be persued in this behalf. Section 53 of the Act clearly makes a distinction between contested and uncontested elections. The word 'contest' in its etymological sense indicates a setting of one person or thing against another in a hostile or competing way. The word connotes resistance, opposition and conflict. To a candidate who has been returned unopposed, the term contest cannot at all apply. Therefore the respondent on a plain reading of section 78 of the Act was not bound to lodge the account of the election expenses before the District Election Officer within 30 days of the election and his failure to do so, would not result in any disqualification for him or in setting aside his election. The purpose of the Section 78 also is the same as indicated already namely to safeguard against incurring unauthorised expenditure or expenditure beyond the permissible limits with the sole object of keeping the process of election free from corrupt practices. Therefore this issue No. 4 is decided in favour of the respondent.

The main contest in this election petition is with respect to issue No. 3 part (b). To understand the significance of this issue let me briefly summarise the arguments of the learned counsel for the parties. The argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that under section 34 of the Act the respondent was bound to deposit Rs. 500 as security deposit. Admittedly he has deposited only Rs. 250 therefore under this very section i.e. 34 he shall not be deemed to be duly nominated for election. His nomination paper has been improperly accepted by the Returning Officer. He should therefore be unseated. His further argument was that the result of the election has been materially affected because Ghulam Raza was going to contest the election. He had been deprived of that opportunity.



Apart from the fact whether the story of getting the bus stopped through the intervention and at the instance of the respondent, it is proved that he started for contesting this election. He had not reached Leh for this reason or that. If the respondent is unseated that gentleman and others will have an opportunity to contest the election and it cannot be said at this time whether the respondent or anyone of his prospective opponents would win the election. Therefore the result of the election has been materially affected. This is the crux of the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner. On the other hand the learned counsel for the respondent has argued that this is not a case of improper acceptance of the nomination paper. The security deposit was made. When the papers came for scrutiny before the Returning Officer, no objection was raised as to the insufficiency of the security deposit. In fact the respondent was the only candidate who had filed the nomination paper. On the face of the nomination paper no disqualification was apparent and no objection was taken. Therefore the acceptance of the nomination paper by the Returning Officer was not improper but proper. It was further argued that even if the nomination paper of the respondent had been rejected by the Returning Officer, the process of election would still continue under section 53 of the Act and the election could be only concluded after somebody had been duly declared to be elected. Till that time the election would not be concluded, and therefore there was no question of the result of the election having been materially affected. Further it was argued that nothing has been shown by the petitioner that due to this improper acceptance of the nomination paper of the respondent, even if it is conceded that it is improperly accepted, there is no suggestion even in the evidence of the petitioner that the result of the election has been materially affected. A further argument was advanced that the respondent had offered and placed before the Returning Officer Rs. 500 as security deposit. The Returning Officer had accepted only Rs. 250 being according to his lights the amount required under law to be deposited by the respondent. If the Returning Officer had rejected the nomination paper of the respondent he could have filed an election petition and on this order of the Returning Officer the election petition of the respondent would have succeeded. I will examine all these arguments of the learned counsel for the parties separately.

The last argument of the learned counsel for the respondent does not appeal to me as sound. If the Returning Officer had rejected the nomination paper of the respondent and he were to bring an election petition which would succeed that by itself would not lead to the inference that the nomination paper had been properly accepted. Legally the rejection might have been improper. The acceptance nonetheless may be equally improper. The law on improper acceptance of nomination paper has been the subject matter of many authorities of different election Tribunals High Courts and the Supreme Court. Before the amendment of 1956 in the Representation of People Act improper rejection and improper acceptance of the nomination paper were on the same footing and were covered by section 100(C). In both cases if the result of election were materially affected by either improper acceptance or rejection of a nomination paper the election would be set aside. But the amendment of 1956 places the two under different categories. Now under the amended section improper rejection of a nomination paper is by itself a ground without proving anything further for setting aside the election. Section 100(c) may be perused in that behalf. But the improper acceptance of the nomination paper can be a ground for setting aside the election if the result of the election in so far as it relates to the returned candidate, has been materially affected. Therefore in such cases it has further to be proved that due to the improper acceptance of the nomination paper, the result of the election has been materially affected. It has been held in a number of authorities that this proof must be given by the petitioner though it is a very difficult matter to prove. See 21 E.L.R. 137 and 5 E.L.R. 199. It has been further held that whether the result of the election has been materially affected is essentially a question of fact. See 8 E.L.R. 311, 17 E.L.R. 321 and 3 E.L.R. 423. The Supreme Court in the case of Vashist Narain Sharma Vs. Devchand and others 10 E.L.R. 30 has further laid down three tests (1) where the candidate whose nomination was improperly accepted had secured less votes than the difference between the returned candidate and the candidate securing the next highest number of votes; (2) where the person referred to above secured more votes; and (3) where the person whose nomination has been improperly accepted is the returned candidate himself.

So far as the third case is concerned, they have held that it should be deemed that the result of the election was materially affected (page 37 of the report). The same observations are reported in AIR 1966 Supreme Court 824. In this case according to the argument of the learned counsel for the petitioner no further proof of the result of the election having been materially affected is necessary as it is the returned candidate whose nomination paper has been improperly

accepted. The argument of the learned counsel for the respondent, as indicated already is that the nomination paper of the respondent has been properly accepted. There is no question of its having been accepted improperly. He has based his argument on two authorities viz: 9 E.L.R. 494 and 22 E.L.R. 64. In the former case the Supreme Court has held "if the want of qualification of a candidate does not appear on the face of the nomination paper or the electoral roll, and no objection is raised to his nomination the Returning Officer has no other alternative but to accept the nomination and the acceptance of the nomination cannot in such a case be held to have been 'improper' within the meaning of Section 100(1)(c), even though the Election Tribunal finds subsequently after enquiry that the candidate whose nomination was accepted was not really qualified under the constitution to be chosen as a member of the Legislature. The election cannot be declared wholly void in such a case on account of the improper acceptance of a nomination u/s 100(1)(c) but the case is one of 'non-compliance' with the provisions of the Constitution.. "

In the latter case i.e. 22 E.L.R. 64 so far as this point is concerned, it has been held that when the candidate appears to be properly qualified on the face of the nomination paper and if no objection is raised on that ground before the Returning Officer the acceptance of the nomination must be deemed to be a proper acceptance. It has been further held that it is open to the petitioner to question the validity of the election u/s 100(1)(d)(iv) on other grounds namely, that the candidate whose nomination was accepted was not qualified at all or could not be deemed to be duly nominated as a candidate for the reason that he did not comply with the provisions of section 33(3) of the Act. The learned counsel has further argued that u/s 34 of the Act the candidate who has not made the requisite deposit of the security money shall not be deemed to be duly nominated for election. The same is the language of the section 33(3) which refers to a candidate who has held any office or has been dismissed and the period of five years has not elapsed since the dismissal, such person shall not be deemed to be duly nominated as a candidate unless his nomination paper is accompanied by a certificate issued in the prescribed manner..." Here also such a candidate shall not be deemed to be duly nominated in the absence of a certificate. Similarly argues the learned counsel there was no apparent error in the nomination paper and there was no objection taken by anybody to the validity of the nomination paper. Therefore on the authority of Durga Shankar Mehta and S. M. Banerji cases (reported as 9 E.L.R. 494 and 22 E.L.R. 64) the acceptance of the nomination paper of the respondent shall be deemed to be proper. In the former case the candidate was below 25 years of age and as such could not stand for election. In the latter case the disqualification of the candidate was among other things u/s 33(3) of the Act. There are other authorities also on the point which may be referred as under:—

16 E.L.R. 74, is a decision of the Bombay High Court 17 E.L.R. 321 is a decision of the Orissa High Court.

5 E.L.R. 190 is a decision of the Election Tribunal Rewa

7 E.L.R. 235 is a decision of the Election Tribunal Ludhiana

In 10 E.L.R. 461 the Tribunal went so far as to say that the result of the election cannot be held to be materially affected by any improper acceptance of a nomination paper unless it is proved that if this nomination had not been accepted the result of the election would have been substantially different from what it was i.e. that the returned candidate would not have been returned and a different candidate would have succeeded at the election. Further argument of the learned counsel for the respondent in this behalf has been that it has not at all been proved as it could not be that the result of the election has been materially affected. According to him the respondent was the only candidate who had filed his nomination paper. If his nomination papers were rejected the process of election would continue till somebody would have been declared as elected candidate. For this proposition he placed reliance on the case of Dr. Narayan Bhaskar Khare *Versus* Election Commission of India reported as 13 E.L.P. 112. In that case their Lordships have held that:—

"the words "election" occurring in article 71 means the entire election process culminating in a candidate being declared elected and doubts and disputes arising out of or in connection with any of the stages of such completed election have to be inquired into and decided by this court which, in point of time, must necessarily be after the completion of the entire process compendiously called the election" (Pages 121 and 122 of the report).

According to the counsel if the nomination paper of the respondent had been rejected there would be new nomination papers invited and this election would

be deemed to have come to an end only after somebody had been declared an elected candidate. There is much force in all these arguments of the learned counsel for the respondent. On the basis of the propositions of law laid down in the above authorities it can be safely held that the nomination paper of the respondent has been properly accepted.

The respondent was the only candidate who had put in his nomination paper. In the circumstances of the case there was no disqualification apparent on the nomination form nor was any discovered much less was any objection taken by anybody to the nomination. Therefore in terms of 9 E.L.R. 494 and 22 E.L.R. 64 the nomination paper of the respondent had been properly accepted.

A part from these arguments the matter can be viewed from a different angle altogether. In this case it has been held by me all that can be construed in favour of the petitioner is that Gulam Raza travelled by bus number 236 JKA from Kargil and was bound for Leh. It has not been proved according to me that he was going to contest this election. Therefore the only candidate who had thought of standing for this election was the respondent who actually filed his nomination paper before the Returning Officer. He went with the requisite amount of security deposit and actually offered to and placed before the Returning Officer a sum of Rs. 500 as security deposit. The Returning Officer under a mistaken notion of law and in his ignorance impressed upon the respondent in spite of the latter's insistence, that only Rs. 250 was the security money necessary to be deposited. It is in evidence of the witnesses produced by the respondent namely Tashi Rigzan, Sonam Wangal, Chewang Rigzan and the respondent that the respondent offered Rs. 500 to the Returning Officer as the security money. Tashi Rigzan and Sonam Wangal and the respondent definitely state that Rs. 500 was presented as security by the respondent to the Returning Officer. Chawang Rigzan the Election Naib Tehsildar who was working with Mr. Narboo the Returning Officer stated that the Returning Officer directed him to receive only Rs. 250 as the security amount, being the proper amount of security which the witness took and issued a receipt therefor. Therefore all that the respondent was required to do under the law had been done by him. He had even placed the money before the Returning Officer. Under sub-section 2 of section 34 any sum required to be deposited under sub-section 1 of that section should be either deposited or caused to be deposited with the Returning Officer in cash or a receipt should be produced before him showing that the money has been deposited in the Reserve Bank of India or in the Government Treasury. In this case the amount was actually placed before the Returning Officer who directed his Naib Tehsildar to receive only Rs. 250 therefrom, which was done by the Naib Tehsildar who also issued a receipt for the same. In my opinion the respondent has substantially complied with the terms of Section 34 of the Act and therefore he is not to blame at all. It has been held in numerous authorities even that of the Supreme Court that there must be substantial compliance with the provisions of Section 34 of the Act and too much of technicality should not be insisted upon. Though those decisions namely 21 E.L.R. 172, 21 E.L.R. 54 and 22 E.L.R. 86 etc. are in a different context but the principle laid down in these authorities can be safely invoked in the present case. There was substantial compliance by the respondent with the provisions of Section 34 of the Act in so far as he actually placed before the Returning Officer a sum of Rs. 500 as security deposit. In substance to use the language of the section he deposited the amount with the Returning Officer.

The action of the respondent is fully protected by the oft quoted maxim of 'Actus Curiae neminem gravabit' i.e. act of court should do no harm to the litigant. In this case it was only the act of the Returning Officer that resulted in the return of Rs. 250 to the respondent out of Rs. 500, thus making his security deposit short by Rs. 250. Authorities for this proposition of law can be cited and they are numerous. A few cases may be mentioned:—

(1) *Rhodesy Versus Koylesh* 13 W.R. F.B. page 3 (Full-Bench).

(2) *Bani Madhub Mitter Versus Matungini Dassi* 13 Calcutta, 104 (Full Bench)

This maxim has been applied to the acts of public servants also apart from courts. Sir Barnes Peacock in the Privy Council case reported as *Makhum Lal Pandey Versus Sah Koondun Lal* 2 I.A. 210 remarked:—

"Now, considering that the registration of all conveyances of immovable property of the value of Rs. 100 or upwards is, by the Act, rendered compulsory, and that proper legal advice is not generally accessible to persons taking conveyances of land small value, it is scarcely reasonable to suppose that it was the intention of the Legislature that every

registration of a deed should be null and void by reason of a non-compliance with the provisions of Section 16, 21 or 36 or other similar provisions. It is rather to be inferred that the Legislature intended that such errors and defects should be classed under the general words "defect in procedure" in section 88 of the Act, so that innocent and ignorant persons should not be deprived of their property through any error or inadvertence of a public officer on whom they would naturally place reliance.

In a recent case, reported as AIR 1966 Supreme Court 1631, the Supreme Court held that when in a pre-emption decree the decree-holder was directed to deposit by a certain date the pre-emption money and the deposit was made within time, but less by one Rupee, which mistake was due to the error on the part of the officer of the court in filling the challan, that the mistake should be rectified and the parties should not be made to suffer.

The respondent therefore cannot be punished for any of error committed by the Returning Officer in calculating the security deposit required for the Parliamentary Constituency seat.

The result is that the present petition fails and is dismissed with costs Counsel's fee Rs. 300.

An intimation of the substance of the decision of this case shall be communicated to the Election Commission, to the Speaker of the Lok Sabha and an authenticated copy of the decision shall also be sent to the Election Commission.

JAMMU.

December 21, 1967.

[No. 82/2/J&K/HP/67.]

*New Delhi, the 16th January 1968*

**S.O. 377.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 13A of the Representation of the People Act, 1950 (43 of 1950), the Election Commission, in consultation with the Government of West Bengal hereby nominates Shri S. K. Mukherjee, Secretary to the Government of West Bengal, Commerce and Industries Department, as the Chief Electoral Officer for the State of West Bengal with effect from the date he takes over charge and until further orders, *vide* Shri S. Dutt Mazumdar transferred.

[No. 154/14/68.]

## ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 17th January 1968*

**S.O. 378.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Kadi Bong a contesting candidate for election to the House of the People from Bastar constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And Whereas the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Kadi Bong to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-HP/17/67.]

*New Delhi, the 18th January 1968*

**S.O. 379.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri A. Muthusamy, Agent of Life Insurance Corporation, Punjaipullampatti Gobichettipalayam, Coimbatore District, Madras State, a contesting candidate for election to the House of the People from 21-Gobichettipalayam Parliamentary constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses in the manner required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri A. Muthusamy to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MD-HP/21/67.]

*New Delhi, the 18th January 1968*

**S.O. 380.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Mangaliya a contesting candidate for election to the House of the People from Morena constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And Whereas the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Mangaliya to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. MP-HP/1/67.]

*New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968*

**S.O. 381.**—Whereas the Election Commission is satisfied that Shri Ramnandan Rai of Village Gaura, P.O. Gaura Gote, District Muzaffarpur (Bihar), a contesting candidate for election to the House of the People from Pupri Constituency, has failed to lodge an account of his election expenses as required by the Representation of the People Act, 1951, and the Rules made thereunder;

And whereas the said candidate, even after due notice has not given any reason or explanation for the failure;

Now, therefore, in pursuance of section 10A of the said Act, the Election Commission hereby declares the said Shri Ramnandan Rai to be disqualified for being chosen as, and for being, a member of either House of Parliament or of the Legislative Assembly or Legislative Council of a State for a period of three years from the date of this order.

[No. BR-HP/12/67(22).]

By Order,

K. S. RAJAGOPALAN, Secy.

## MINISTRY OF LAW

(Legislative Department)

### CORRIGENDUM

*New Delhi, the 12th January 1968*

**S.O. 382.**—In the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Law No. S.O. 2775, dated the 8th August, 1967, published in the Gazette of India,

Extraordinary, Part II. Section 3, Sub-Section (ii). dated the 8th August, 1967, for the words "Beawar *vice* Shri Sharaf Ali" read "general information".

[No. F. 5(35)/67-Elec.]

A. S. LOKANATHAN, Under Secy.

---

### MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS

*New Delhi, the 19th January 1968*

**S.O. 383.**—In pursuance of clause (1) of article 239 of the Constitution, the President hereby directs that the Chief Commissioner, Chandigarh, shall, subject to the control of the President and until further orders, exercise the powers and discharge the functions of the Central Government under the Punjab State Aid to Industries Act, 1935 (Punjab Act. No. 5 of 1935), as in force in the Union territory of Chandigarh and as adapted by the Punjab Reorganisation (Chandigarh) Adaptation of Laws on concurrent and State subjects (No. 2) order, 1968, in relation to that Union territory.

[No. 25/64/67-DH(S).]

B. C. PARIJA, Dy. Secy.

---

### MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Economic Affairs)

*New Delhi, the 16th January 1968*

**S.O. 384.**—In terms of clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 19 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), the Central Government hereby nominates Shri S. S. Shiralkar, 62, Lodi Estate, New Delhi, as a Director of the State Bank of India, *vice* Shri S. Jagannathan, I.C.S.

[No. F. 8/17/68-S.B.]

D. N. GHOSH, Dy. Secy.

---

(Department of Economic Affairs)

*New Delhi, the 16th January 1968*

**S.O. 385.**—In pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 8 of the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934 (2 of 1934), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance, Department of Economic Affairs, No. F 3(62)-BC/66, dated the 17th November, 1966, the Central Government hereby nominates Dr. I. G. Patel, to be a Director of the Central Board of the Reserve Bank of India, *vice* Shri S. Jagannathan.

[No. F. 3(21)-BC/68.]

S. S. SHIRALKAR, Addl. Secy.

---

(Department of Economic Affairs)

*New Delhi, the 16th January 1968*

**S.O. 386.**—Whereas on 29th April 1961 a scheme of amalgamation of the Travancore Forward Bank Ltd., Kottayam, with the State Bank of Travancore was

sanctioned by the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by and in accordance with section 45 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949.

Whereas under sub-clause (iv) of clause 7 of the said scheme, the State Bank of Travancore was required to make a final valuation of the assets of the Travancore Forward Bank Ltd., which have been provisionally valued on the prescribed date, on the expiry of six years from the prescribed date.

Whereas the State Bank of Travancore has represented that in view of the large number of assets involved and the recovery of most of the items yet to be realised inspite of its efforts, it has not been able to make the final valuation within the time specified in sub-clause (iv) of clause 7 of the scheme of amalgamation.

And whereas the Central Government in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India is satisfied that a difficulty has arisen in giving effect to the scheme of amalgamation which it is necessary to remove by extending the time within which the final valuation of assets is required to be made.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 19 of the scheme of amalgamation dated 29th April 1961 of the Travancore Forward Bank Ltd., Kottayam, with the State Bank of Travancore, the Central Government hereby directs, that the State Bank of Travancore shall, in consultation with and with the approval of the Reserve Bank of India, value the assets of the Travancore Forward Bank Ltd., Kottayam, which have been provisionally valued on the prescribed date, within a period of nine years from the prescribed date.

[No F. 17(10)-BC/67 (i).]

**S.O. 387.**—Whereas on 16th May, 1961 a scheme of amalgamation of the Kottayam Orient Bank Ltd., Kottayam, with the State Bank of Travancore was sanctioned by the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by and in accordance with section 45 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949.

Whereas under sub-clause (iv) of clause 7 of the said scheme, the State Bank of Travancore was required to make a final valuation of the assets of the Kottayam Orient Bank Ltd., which have been provisionally valued on the prescribed date, on the expiry of six years from the prescribed date.

Whereas the State Bank of Travancore has represented that in view of the large number of assets involved and the recovery of most of the items yet to be realised inspite of its efforts, it has not been able to make the final valuation within the time specified in sub-clause (iv) of clause 7 of the scheme of amalgamation.

And whereas the Central Government in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India is satisfied that a difficulty has arisen in giving effect to the scheme of amalgamation which it is necessary to remove by extending the time within which the final valuation of assets is required to be made.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 20 of the scheme of amalgamation dated 16th May, 1961 of the Kottayam Orient Bank Ltd., Kottayam, with the State Bank of Travancore the Central Government hereby directs, that the State Bank of Travancore shall, in consultation with and with the approval of the Reserve Bank of India, value the assets of the Kottayam Orient Bank Ltd., Kottayam, which have been provisionally valued on the prescribed date, within a period of nine years from the prescribed date.

[No F. 17(10)-BC/67 (ii).]

**S.O. 388.**—Whereas on 16th May, 1961 a scheme of amalgamation of the Bank of New India Ltd., Trivandrum, with the State Bank of Travancore was sanctioned by the Central Government in exercise of the powers conferred by and in accordance with section 45 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949.

Whereas under sub-clause (iv) of clause 7 of the said scheme, the State Bank of Travancore was required to make a final valuation of the assets of the Bank of New India Ltd., which have been provisionally valued on the prescribed date, on the expiry of six years from the prescribed date.

Whereas the State Bank of Travancore has represented that in view of the large number of assets involved and the recovery of most of the items yet to be realised inspite of its efforts, it has not been able to make the final valuation within the time specified in sub-clause (iv) of clause 7 of the scheme of amalgamation.

And whereas the Central Government in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India is satisfied that a difficulty has arisen in giving effect to the scheme of amalgamation which it is necessary to remove by extending the time within which the final valuation of assets is required to be made.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause 20 of the scheme of amalgamation dated 16th May, 1961 of the Bank of New India Ltd., Trivandrum with the State Bank of Travancore, the Central Government hereby directs, that the State Bank of Travancore shall, in consultation with and with the approval of the Reserve Bank of India, value the assets of the Bank of New India Ltd., Trivandrum, which have been provisionally valued on the prescribed date, within a period of nine years from the prescribed date.

[No. F. 17(10)-BC/67 (iii).]



## (Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 18th January 1968

S.O. 389. - Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India as on the 12th January 1968

## BANKING DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
Capital Paid Up	5 00,00,000	Notes	17 45,60,000
		Rs. 100 Coin	2,96,000
Reserve Fund	80 30,00,000	Small Coins	4,39,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	131,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted--	
		(a) Internal	..
		(b) External	..
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund	25,00,00,000	(c) Government Treasury Bills	284,14,48,000
National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund	30,00,00,000	Balances Held Abroad*	103,20,22,000
		Investments**	180,59,54,000
		Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) Central Government	..
		(ii) State Governments@	47,71,03,000
Deposits—		Loans and Advances to :—	
(a) Government—		(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks†	4,05,43,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks††	200,96,27,000
(f) Central Government	54,61,73,000	(iii) Others	2,48,05,000

LIABILITIES	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.
		Loans, Advances and Investments from National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—	
(ii) State Governments	7,62,20,000	(a) Loans and Advances to :—	
		(i) State Governments . . . . .	27,86,53,000
		(ii) State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	13,31,89,000
		(iii) Central Land Mortgage Banks . . . . .	..
(b) Banks—		(b) Investment in Central Land Mortgage Bank Debentures	7,89,36,000
(i) Scheduled Commercial Banks . . . . .	140,73,23,000	Loans and Advances from National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund—	
(ii) Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	5,85,62,000	Loans and Advances to State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	8,04,48,000
(iii) Non-Scheduled State Co-operative Banks . . . . .	1,00,74,000		
(iv) Other Banks . . . . .	9,74,000	Loans, Advances and Investments from National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund—	
(c) Others . . . . .	362,60,28,000	(a) Loans and Advances to the Development Bank . . . . .	5,86,85,000
Bills Payable . . . . .	29,66,72,000	(b) Investment in bonds/debentures issued by the Development Bank . . . . .	..
Other Liabilities . . . . .	79,27,90,000	Other Assets . . . . .	48,81,08,000
Rupees	952,48,16,000	Rupees	952,48,16,000

\*Includes Cash and Short-term Securities.

\*\*Excluding Investments from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Industrial Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund.

@ Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund, but including temporary overdrafts to State Governments.

†Includes Rs. 1,59,03,000 advanced to scheduled commercial banks against usance bills under Section 17(4)(c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

††Excluding Loans and Advances from the National Agricultural Credit (Long Term Operations) Fund and the National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 12th day of January 1968  
ISSUE DEPARTMENT

LIABILITIES	Rs.	Rs.	ASSETS	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department . . . . .	17,45,60,000		Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in Circulation . . . . .	3097,53,50,000		(a) Held in India . . . . .	115,89,25,000	
Total Notes issued . . . . .		3114,99,10,000	(b) Held outside India . . . . .	..	
			Foreign Securities . . . . .	166,42,00,000	
			TOTAL . . . . .		282,31,25,000
			Rupee Coin . . . . .		77,43,43,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities . . . . .		2755,24,42,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper . . . . .		..
TOTAL LIABILITIES . . . . .		3114,99,10,000	TOTAL ASSETS . . . . .		3114,99,10,000

Dated the 17th day of January, 1968

L. K. JHA,  
Governor.  
[No. F. 3(3)-BC/68.]

*New Delhi, the 19th January 1968*

**S.O. 390.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 53 of the Banking Regulation Act, 1949 (10 of 1949), the Central Government, on the recommendation of the Reserve Bank of India, hereby declares that the provisions of section 9 of the said Act shall not apply to the Bank of Karad Ltd., Karad, in respect of the property at Plot No. 35, Shaniwar Peth, Market Yard, Karad, till the 26th March, 1968.

*awM*

[No. F. 15(2)-BC/68.]

*New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968*

**S.O. 391.**—In pursuance of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of Section 21 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), the Central Government, in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby nominates Shri D. G. Shembekar of Baramati, Maharashtra State to be a member of the Bombay Local Board of the State Bank of India

[No. F. 8/93/67-SB.]

*New Delhi, the 24th January 1968*

**S.O. 392.**—In pursuance of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 21 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), the Central Government, in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby nominates the following persons to be members of the Hyderabad Local Board with effect from the 1st February, 1968:—

- (1) Shri A. Srinivasachari, Bank Street, Hyderabad-1.
- (2) Shri E. B. V. Raghavaiah, Kunderu, P.O. Krishna, District Krishna, Hyderabad.
- (3) Shri Macherla Rama Row, Bio-Chemicals and Synthetic Products, Sanathnagar, Hyderabad.
- (4) Shri R. L. Gupta, Principal, Administrative Staff College of India, Bella Vista, Hyderabad.

[No. F. 8/16/68-SB.]

V. SWAMINATHAN, Under Secy.

**(Department of Revenue and Insurance)**

**INCOME-TAX ESTABLISHMENTS**

*New Delhi, the 17th January 1968*

**S.O. 393.**—In pursuance of clause (b) of sub-rule (ii), of rule 2 of the Appellate Tribunal Rules, 1946, the Central Government has been pleased to appoint Shri K. Sundaresh Bhatt, Income-tax Officer, Class II as Junior Authorised Representative Second Bench of the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal, Madras with effect from the forenoon of 5th August, 1967.

[No. 17.]

M. G. THOMAS, Under Secy.

**(Department of Revenue & Insurance)**

**INCOME-TAX**

*New Delhi, the 20th January 1968*

**S.O. 394.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary and expedient in public interest to publish the names and other particular relating to the assesseees on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed,—

- (a) for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1963 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1963-64;
- (b) for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1963 and ending with 31st March, 1964 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of;
- (c) for the failure to file returns of income or to produce books of account during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1964, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1963-64; and

- (d) for the non-payment of tax during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1964 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1963-64;

and whereas in the cases of assesseees on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1963 whose names and other particulars were published with the Notifications of the Government of India, Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue) No. 91/58/2/62-IT dated the 22nd December, 1962 and No. 7/58/48/63-IT dated the 29th January, 1964 and in whose cases the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal has subsequently reduced or cancelled the penalty so imposed;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961) and of all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Central Government hereby publishes, in Schedules I to V hereto annexed, the names and other particulars of the assesseees aforesaid.

#### SCHEDULE I

Assesseees on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1963 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed there for or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1963-64.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
			Rs.	
	<i>Madhya Pradesh.</i>			
1	M/s. Madhoji Deoraj, Dhamtari	Registered Firm	20,000	1958-59
	<i>Mysore</i>			
2	M/s. Krishna Auto Sales & Service Corporation, Shimoga.	Registreed Firm	6,000	1962-63
	<i>Punjab.</i>			
3	M/s. Lakhmi Chand Manak Chand, Akali Market, Amritsar	Registered Firm	10,000	1961-62

#### SCHEDULE II

Assesseees on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1963 and ending with 31st March, 1964 where no first appeal was presented with in the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
			Rs.	
	<i>Bombay City-I.</i>			
1	M/s. Manekchand Panachand, Sheikh Memon St., Bombay.	Registered Firm	5,000	1947-48
	<i>Bombay City-II.</i>			
2	Shri Amritlal Memchand, Prop. M/s. A. N. Bulakidas, Dwarkesh Gali, M.J.C. Market, Bombay	Individual	5,195	1958-59

1	2	3	4	5
3	Shri Babubhai Vallabhdas, Prop. M/s. Diamond Art Photo Studio, 182, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay	Individual	6,002 6,351 6,323 8,357 5,000 5,000 5,000	1954-55 1955-56 1956-57 1957-58 1955-56 1956-57 1957-58 1958-59
4	Shri Balajanoo Bolke, Bellasis Road, Bombay	Individual	5,000 5,000 5,000	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62
5	M/s. Bombay Andhra Transport Co., 113, Chakla Street, Bombay	Registered Firm	10,394	1960-61
6	M/s. Crescent Trading Co., 48, Bhaji Pala Lane, Bombay	Registered Firm	18,822 5,040	1961-62 1961-62
7	M/s. D.M.G. (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd., Union Bank Building, Apollo Street, Bombay	Company	7,000	1962-63
8	Shri Devji Velji Kattira, Gaya Building, 109, Masjid Bunder Road, Bombay	Individual	10,917	1959-60
9	Shri Fida Hussein G. Arsiwalla, 112, Abdul Rehman Street, Bombay	Individual	12,000	1961-62
10	Shri Ibrahim Jetha (Decd.) through his legal heirs C/o. M/s. Jetha & Co., Opp. Byculla Railway Station, Bombay	Individual	5,597	1960-61
11	M/s. M. R. Modi, Mangaldas Road, Bombay	Registered Firm	9,000	1958-59
12	M/s. Narbharam Motilal Bros., 185-86, Laxmi Galli, Swadeshi Market, Bombay	Registered Firm	25,000	1962-63
13	M/s. P.L. Bhatt & Co., 104, Apollo Street, Bombay	Registered Firm	18,800	1960-61
14	M/s. Prem & Sons Ltd., 30, Bibijan Street, Bombay	Company	10,000	1961-62
15	M/s. Rameshchander Vishram, Sir Vithaldas Lane, M.J.C. Market, Bombay	Registered Firm	5,010	1961-62
16	M/s. Shantilal Kalidas Bros., Sancha Galli, M.J.C. Market, Bombay	Registered Firm	11,650 25,757 14,507 9,573 8,282	1951-52 1952-53 1954-55 1958-59 1959-60
17	M/s. Sikhri & Grover, 79-E, Princess Street, Bombay	Registered Firm	12,200	1959-60
<i>Bombay City-III.</i>				
18	Shri D. T. Raheja, Mohatta Market, Palton Road, Bombay	Individual	8,872	1959-60
19	M/s. Prataprai & Co., 52-54, Masjid Bunder Road, Bombay	Registered Firm	8,400	1959-60
<i>Bombay (Central).</i>				
20	M/s. Jesinglal Ramchand & Co., 17, II Pophalwadi, Bombay-2	Registered Firm	21,468	1958-5
21	M/s. Ramnarain Sons Pvt. Ltd., State Bank Building, Bank Street, Bombay	Company	18,075 29,755 26,062	1951-5 1952-5 1953-5

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Gujarat-I</i>				
22	M/s. Express Trading Corporation, Ahmedabad	Registered Firm	5,064	1944-45
23	M/s. Girdharilal Balabhai, Kapadwanj	Registered Firm	7,035	1960-61
<i>Gujarat-II</i>				
24	Shri Hormasji Manchetji Vaid, Vapi, Tal. Pardi	Individual	6,366	1963-64
25	Shri Nagindas Chandulal, Manek Chowk, Ahmedabad	Individual	5,058	1960-61
26	Shri Sevantilal Chandulal, Manek Chowk, Ahmedabad	Individual	5,004	1960-61
<i>Kerala</i>				
27	M/s. Vijaya Oil Mills, Alleppy	Registered Firm	12,450	1959-60
<i>Madras</i>				
28	Shri C. N. Varadappan, Land Lord, Nazarethpet, Poonamallee	Individual	5,000	1955-56
29	M/s. N. Veeraswamy Chettiar, Mettupalayam	Registered Firm	8,940 19,430 29,000	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62
30	M/s. R. Srinivas & Co., East Veli Street, Madurai	Registered Firm	40,000	1961-62
31	M/s. T. N. Subbaramier & Bros., Manjanakara Street, Madurai	Hindu Undivided Family	5,000	1951-52
<i>Madras (Central).</i>				
32	Shri K. M. Mohamed Abdulkader, Tanner, Dindigul	Individual	9,300	1959-60
<i>Mysore</i>				
33	M/s. B.G. Tegur & C. S. Hosakeri, Forest Contractors, Alanavar	Registered Firm	5,501	1961-62
34	M/s. Nagar Srinivasa Rao, Mangalore.	Firm	13,759 11,479	1958-59 1959-60
35	M/s. New Taj Mahal Cafe (P) Ltd., Mangalore	Company	5,000	1958-59
36	Shri P. S. Murugiah Mudaliar, Contractor, Kargal	Individual	5,000	1962-63
37	Shri R. B. Subbaiah, 40, Viviyam Road, Richards Town, Bangalore	Hindu Undivided Family	10,000 10,000	1958-59 1959-60
38	M/s. R. K. B. Rice Mills, Hebbal K.R. Nagar, Taluk, Mysore District	Registered Firm	5,000	1962-63
39	Shri Syed Ibrahim, Contractor, Shimoga	Individual	6,000	1961-62
<i>Punjab</i>				
40	M/s. Phool Chand Sheo Prasad, Hansi	Registered Firm	55,000	1957-58

1	2	3	4	5
<i>West Bengal-I.</i>				
41	Shri A. C. Law, 8, Old Post Office Street, Calcutta	Individual	10,000	1961-62
42	M. S. British Reinforced Concrete Engineering Co. Ltd., Calcutta	Individual Company	60,000	1960-61
<i>West Bengal-III.</i>				
43	Shri Kishorilal Mahawar, 27, Amratolla Street, Calcutta	Individual	7,543	1954-55
	<i>Calcutta (Central)</i>			
44	M/s. S. B. Industrial Development Ltd., 26, Prasanna Kumar Tagore Street, Calcutta	Company	25,689 99,915	1951-52 1954-55

## SCHEDULE-III

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the failure to file returns of income or to produce books of account during the period commencing with 1st April 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1964, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1963-64.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
<i>Andhra Pradesh.</i>			Rs.	
1	M/s. Undavalli Surya Rao & Others, Kakinada	Registered Firm	5,000	1959-60
<i>Bombay City-I.</i>				
2	Shri B. K. Modi, Prop. Prestige Pictures, Wellington Colony, Santacruz, Bombay	Individual	8,148	1959-60
3	M/s. Kaladarpan (defunct), 249, Famous Cine Building, Bombay-II	Unregistered Firm	5,867	1961-62
4	M/s. S. P. Pictures (defunct), 205, Famous Cine Building, Bombay-II	Unregistered Firm	5,562	1961-62
<i>Bombay City-II.</i>				
5	Shri Tricunddas Gopaldas, C/o. M/s. Hiralal Chhaganlal, Old Stock Exchange Bldg., Dalal Street, Bombay	Individual	6,600	1955-56
<i>Bombay City-III.</i>				
6	M/s. R. G. Kate, Book Binders, Nawiwadi, Bombay	Registered Firm	8,749	1962-63
7	Shri Shantilal Lalji, C/o. M/s. Mahendra Kumar Shantilal & Co., Bank of Baroda Building, Palton Road, Bombay	Individual	5,084	1959-60



1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>				
8	Shri Abdulbhai Hassanali, Nagpur	Individual	13,575	1959-60
			13,288	1960-61
9	Shri Ashghar Ali Hassan Ali, Nagpur	Individual	12,135	1959-60
10	M/s. Chunilal Champalal Bhagna, Neemuch	Registered Firm	11,588	1960-61
			10,600	1960-61
11	M/s. Harnam Singh & Sons, Indore	Registered Firm	9,575	1958-59
12	Shri Vimal Kumar Thakuria, Indore	Individual	5,900	1963-64
<i>Poona</i>				
13	M/s. Charbhai Bidi Works, 582, Nanapeth, Poona	Registered Firm	5,244	1958-59
14	Shri J. P. Vora, 54, Budhwar Peth, Poona	Individual	8,622	1961-62
15	Shri N. R. Mithpalli, Poona	Hindu Undivided Family	7,709	1960-61
16	M/s. Nemchand Tarachand Gandhi, Akluj, District Sholapur	Registered Firm	5,359	1959-60
17	M/s. Pioneer Dyeing House Ltd. (in Liquidation), 625, Sadashiv Peth, Poona	Company	5,445	1958-59
18	M/s. Tohilyaram Hotchand Co., Lakshmi Market, Sholapur	Registered Firm	5,877	1960-61
<i>Punjab</i>				
19	M/s. Gurdaspur Roller Flour Mills, Gurdaspur	Registered Firm	6,913	1960-61
20	Shri Hansraj Saraf, Timber Merchant, Akhnoor	Individual	12,500	1959-60

## SCHEDULE-IV

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for non-payment of tax during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1964 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1963-64.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
<i>Bombay City-I</i>				
1	M/s. Elphinstone Spinning & Weaving Mills Co. Ltd., Kamani Chambers, Bellard Estate, Bombay	Company	40,000	1962-63
2	Shri Mahadev Laxman Dahanukar, Industrial Assurance Building, Churchgate, Bombay	Individual	7,500	1962-63
<i>Bombay City-II</i>				
3	M/s. Prabhat Stove & Lamp Products Pvt. Ltd., Noble Chambers, Parsi Bazar Street, Bombay	Company	5,000	1962-63

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Bombay (Central)</i>			Rs.	
4	M/s. Devidayal (Sales) Pvt. Ltd., Gupta Mills Estate, Reay Road, Bombay . . . . .	Company . . . . .	10,000 10,000	} 1963-64
5	M/s. Devidayal Stainless Steel Industries Pvt. Ltd., Gupta Mills Estate, Reay Road, Bombay . . . . .	Company . . . . .	5,000	
6	M/s. Shah Construction Co. Ltd, 198, Churchgate Reclamation, Bombay . . . . .	Company . . . . .	6,358	1962-63
7	M/s. Tractors & Bulldozers Pvt. Ltd., Construction House, Bellard Estate, Bombay . . . . .	Company . . . . .	6,000	1962-63
<i>Punjab</i>				
8	Shri Mothu Ram, C/o M/s. Mothu Ram Prem Chand, Ludhiana . . . . .	Individual . . . . .	5,000	1961-62
<i>Calcutta (Central)</i>				
9	M/s. Bengal Jute Mills Co. Ltd., 8, Dalhousie Square East, Calcutta . . . . .	Company . . . . .	1,10,000	1961-62
10	Shri Sri Shew Prasad Bagaria, 46, Strand Road, Calcutta . . . . .	Individual . . . . .	5,000 5,000	1959-60 1962-63
11	M/s. Soorajmul Nagarmull, 8, Dalhousie Square East, Calcutta . . . . .	Unregistered Firm	30,000	1957-58

SCHEDULE—V

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1963 whose names and other particulars were published with the Notifications of the Government of India in the Ministry of Finance (Department of Revenue No. 91/58/2/62-IT dated the 22nd December, 1962 and No. 7/58/48/63-IT dated the 29th January, 1964 and in whose cases the Income-tax Appellate Tribunal has subsequently reduced or cancelled the penalty so imposed.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Amount of penalty reduced to	Assessment year	Sl. No. of Notification	Notification	No. & date
1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
			Rs.	Rs.				
<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>								
1	M/s. E. Kondaiah & G. Satyanarayana, Nandyal	Registered Firm . . .	10,000	Nil	1948-49	13	Schedule I Notification No. 7/58/48/63-IT dated 29-1-1964.	
2	Shri Valveti Sriramulu, Chinnagan-jam . . . . .	Individual . . . . .	20,650	5,000	1948-49	57		
			5,150	1,000	1949-50	57		
3	M/s. Y. Lakshminarayana & Pullaiah, Nandyal . . . . .	Registered Firm . . .	5,000	2,000	1948-49	59		
<i>Bombay City-II</i>								
4	M s. Shivlal Desai & Sons, 70, Stock Exchange, Fort, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm . . .	20,000	Nil	1957-58	46		
5	Shri T. D. Desai, 19, Nanabhai Lane, Bombay-1 . . . . .	Individual . . . . .	19,000 18,000 21,000 30,000	Nil	1956-57 1957-58 1958-59 1959-60	47	Schedule II, Notification No. 91/58/2/62-IT dated 22-12-1962.	
<i>Bombay (Central)</i>								
6	Shri Deviprasad Kejriwal, 177-178, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay . . . . .	Hindu Undivided Family	7,000	3,000	1954-55	15	Schedule II, Notification No. 7/58/48/63-IT dated 29-1-1964.	
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>								
7	Snri Munnalal Beharilal, Khurai . . . . .	Hindu Undivided Family	5,000	Nil	1954, 5	40	Schedule II, Notification No. 7/58/48/63 -IT dated 29-1-1964.	

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
			Rs.	Rs.			
<i>Madras</i>							
8	M/s. Dhurvas N. Jeoyarier & Sons, Madurai	Registered Firm . . .	9,000	5,000	1960-61	11	} Schedule I of Notification No. 758/48/63-IT, da- ted 29-1-1964.
9	Shri M. S. David, Rajapalayam . . .	Individual . . .	5,000	2,500	1958-59	31	
10	Shri P. V. Mohamed, Ghouse, Prop: Wahith Motor Service, 247, Ramnad Road, Madurai	Individual . . .	17,500	7,500	1957-58	40	
11	M/s. S. K. A. S. Sanjeevi Raja, Raja- palayam	Registered Firm . . .	5,000	3,000	1957-58	48	
12	Smt. S. M. Sornabaghyam Ammal, Prop: Ramani Coffee Works, Tiru- pattur, Ramnad District	Individual . . .	11,000	5,000	1956-57	49	
13	Shri S. R. Varadarajulu Naidu, Pon- nagaram, Madurai	Individual . . .	6,000	4,500	1951-52	51	
14	M/s. T. S. Periakaruppa Nadar & Another, West Masi Street, Madurai	Registered Firm . . .	5,000	2,000	1959-60	55	
15	M/s. T.S.T. Peria Nadar & Sons, Dam Street, Colombo . . .	Registered Firm . . .	20,000	15,000	1943-44	56	
<i>West Bengal-I</i>							
16	Shri Santosh Kumar Mukherjee, 8/2, Hastings St., Calcutta . . .	Individual . . .	7,000	Nil	1951-52	44	}
<i>West Bengal-III</i>							
17	Shri H. K. Das, 28, Christopher Road, Calcutta . . .	Individual . . .	50,000	5,000	1946-47	16	

[No. 4 (F. No. 58/20/65-IT (Inv).]

New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968

**S.O. 395.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary and expedient in public interest to publish the names and other particulars relating to the assesseees on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000 was imposed,—

- (a) for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1964, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1964-65;
- (b) for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1964 and ending with 31st March, 1965, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of;
- (c) for the failure to file returns of income or to produce books of account during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1965, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1964-65;
- (d) for the non-payment of tax during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1965 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1964-65;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby publishes, in Schedules I to IV hereto annexed, the names and other particulars of the assesseees aforesaid.

#### SCHEDULE I

Assesseees on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1964 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1964-65.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
<i>Kerala</i>			Rs.	
1	M/s. C. Kanniah Naidu & Sons, Chemists & Druggists, Quilon	Registered Firm	14,000	1961-62
2	Shri K. Kesava Reddiar, Jeweller, Quilon	Individual	10,000	1961-62
3	Shri V. Gopala Pillai, Piece Goods Merchant, Quilon	Individual	₹ 5,232	1962-63
<i>Madhya Pradesh.</i>				
4	Shri Abdulbhai Sk. Abdul Quayum, Surury, Itwara, Burhanpur	Individual	5,873	1957-58
5	M/s. Mehani Stores, Bilaspur	Hindu Undivided Family	9,950	1956-57

1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
6	M/s. Nuhurul Bhaiyalal, Jawahar Market, Raipur . . . . .	Registered Firm	7,523	1961-62
7	M/s. Prabhudayal Shiyarayan, Chhapara . . . . .	Unregistered Firm	11,850	1958-59
8	Shri Saifudin Inayat Hussain, Burhanpur . . . . .	Individual	18,000	1958-59
<i>Madras-I.</i>				
9	M/s. Sha Heeraji Vasthmal, 36-East Avani Noola St., Madurai . . . . .	Registered Firm	7,500	1961-62
10	M/s. R. Srinivas & Co., East Veli St., Madurai . . . . .	Registered Firm	40,000	1961-62
<i>Uttar Pradesh.</i>				
11	M/s. Shining Paper Mart, General Ganj, Kanpur . . . . .	Registered Firm	7,500	1955-56

## SCHEDULE II

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1964 and ending with 31st March, 1965 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>				
1	Shri C. B. Taraporevala, Hyderabad . . . . .	Individual	14,598 14,815 25,530 29,070 26,708 28,626 29,944 27,074 28,649 38,528	1950-52 1951-52 1952-53 1953-54 1954-55 1955-56 1956-57 1957-58 1958-59 1959-60
<i>Bihar &amp; Orissa</i>				
2	Shri Jami Kamaraju Patro, Berhampur . . . . .	Hindu Undivided Family	14,000	1958-59
<i>Bombay City-I.</i>				
3	M/s. Bombay Dyeing & Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Bombay . . . . .	Company	15,000	1961-62
4	M/s. Dhanamal Silk Mills, Dadi Mansion, Barrack Road, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	27,750	1959-60
5	Shri F.C. Mehra, C/o. Eagle Films, 220 Famous Cine Building, Bombay . . . . .	Individual	7,634	1960-61

1	2	3	4	5
6	M/s. G. K. Oil & Soap Industries, Meghji Bhavan, Barrack Road, Bombay	Registered Firm	12,500	1958-59
7	M/s. Indian Cork Mills, Karmani Building, Dr. D. N. Road, Bombay	Registered Firm	35,100	1960-61
8	M/s. Steel Industries of Hindustan Pvt. Ltd., Magazine Street, Mazagaon, Bombay	Company	5,016	1961-62
9	M/s. Tara Sarup, Karmani Building, Dr. D.N. Road, Bombay	Individual	8,000	1959-60
10	M/s. Vog & Co., Empire Building, Dr. D. N. Road, Bombay	Registered Firm	11,850	1962-63
<i>Bombay City-II</i>				
11	Shri Akberalli Abdulhussein, 136 Abdul Rehman Street, Bombay	Individual	7,808	1960-61
12	M/s. Eastern Industries Syndicate, Meadows Street, Bombay	Registered Firm	10,317 10,588 10,546 10,548 9,653	1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62
13	Shri Hasmukhlal Nathalal, 52-58 New Hanuman Lane, Bombay	Individual	7,000	1959-60
14	Shri Jagmohandas Gokaldas, Katra of Gokaldas Hakamchand, C/o. Lalubhai Aminchand (P) Ltd., 30, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay	Hindu Undivided Family	32,713	1964-65
15	Jehangir Dossabhoj & Co., Pvt. Ltd., Bombay	Company	17,000 5,000 29,000 22,000 14,000 11,000	1955-56 1956-57 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63
16	M/s. P. Odernamal, Prop. Shri Bulchand Perimall, 480 Kalbadevi Road, Bombay	Individual (Non-resident)	16,948	1959-60
<i>Bombay City-III</i>				
17	M/s. Abdul Sakoor Umar, Saligara	Registered Firm	28,275	1962-63
18	M/s. Bharat Dyes & Chemicals Co., 8, D'Souza Street, Bombay	Registered Firm	10,300 11,000 13,230 8,000	1955-56 1956-57 1957-58 1958-59
19	M/s. Champaklal Lalwani & Co., 31 Mirza Street, Bombay	Registered Firm	6,163 6,765	1956-57 1959-60
20	Shri Danduram Hardas, C/o M/s. Harsai Hardas & Co., 5, Frere Road, Bombay	Individual	10,000	1955-56
21	M/s. Demji Vessanji & Co., Kurla Street, Bombay	Registered Firm	5,310 5,500	1956-57 1960-61
22	Shri Harsai Hardas, C/o. M/s. Harsai Hardas & Co., 5 Frere Road, Bombay	Individual	10,000	1955-56
23	M/s. Hind Electricals, 607 Gram Road, Bombay	Individual	10,000	1958-59
24	Shri Mohorchand Hardas, C/o. M/s. Harsai Hardas & Co., 5 Frere Road, Bombay	Individual	10,000	1955-56

1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
25	M/s. Nanking Chinese Restaurant, Apollo Pier Road, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	10,000	1962-63
26	M/s. Pravin Colour & Co., 340-42 Samul Street, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	5,000	1960-61
27	M/s. Sindh Para & Co., 131 N.B. Street, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	7,143	1961-62
28	M/s. Doctor & Co. Cathedral St., Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	6,844 6,867 6,814 6,209 5,594 5,899	1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63 1963-64
	<i>Bombay (Central)</i>			
29	Shri Abdul Hussein Gulamalli, 66-68, Narayan Dhuru St., Bombay . . . . .	Individual	41,005	1951-52
30	Shri Amirchand Tulsiram, Gupta Mills Estate, Reay Road, Bombay . . . . .	Individual	10,735 6,952 5,779 7,251	1953-54 1954-55 1955-56 1957-58
31	M/s. Baldotta Bros., Baldotta Bhavan, 117 Queens Road, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	6,048	1958-59
32	M/s. D. Pravinkumar & Co., Ahmedabad Street, Carnac Bunder, Bombay-9.	Registered Firm	10,200 8,000 9,700 11,700	1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61
33	M/s. Kishinchand & Co., (India), 55-57 Empire Bldg., 138, D.N. Road, Fort, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	18,480	1959-60
34	M/s. M. Gullamally Abdul Hussein & Co., 66-68 Narayan Dhuru St., Bombay-3 . . . . .	Firm	46,478	1947-48
35	M/s. N. Futehally & Co., 19 Bank Street, Bombay . . . . .	Registered Firm	33,541	1949-50
	<i>Gujarat-I</i>			
36	M/s. Sagar Textile Mills Ltd., Ramkumar Mills Compound, Saraspur, Ahmedabad . . . . .	Company	6,938	1962-63
	<i>Gujarat II</i>			
37	M/s. Ahmedji Karimji Devdiwala, 4497, Opp. Nagina Masjid, Nariawad, Jamalpur, Ahmedabad.	Registered Firm	7,658 14,058	1962-63 1963-64
38	M/s. Manoharlal Shobhraj, Manekchowk, Ahmedabad.	Registered Firm	7,760 12,128 8,966	1961-62 1963-64 1964-65
39	M/s. Zenith Silk Mills, Lal Darwaja, Surat . . . . .	Registered Firm	18,000 5,000 7,000	1955-56 1956-57 1957-58
	<i>Kerala</i>			
40	Shri K. Ravindranathan Nair, Cashew Exporter, Quilon . . . . .	Individual	6,168	1962-63
41	Shri K. M. Mammu, Commission Agents & Produce Merchants, Baliapatam . . . . .	Individual	11,690	1961-62
42	Shri Kurien Kurien, Ambalal Thungal, Vadavathur, Kottayam . . . . .	Individual	30,000	1962-63



1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
43	M/s. National Nut Co., Quilon . . . . .	Firm	5,101 5,576 9,666 6,427 9,782 12,428	1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63
44	Shri N. Sundaresan, Cashew Exporter, Quilon . . . . .	Individual	8,500	1960-61
45	Shri Varghese Paulo, Vakul, Perumba- voor . . . . .	Individual	5,000	1960-61
<i>Madras-I.</i>				
46	Shri K. Sethuraman Chettiar, Madurai . . . . .	Individual	6,000	1961-62
47	M/s. Kumaraswamy Chetty & Co., 55 Kandappa Chetty St., Madras . . . . .	Registered Firm	16,000	1953-54
48	Shri R. M. Veerabadra Devar, Madurai . . . . .	Individual	6,500	1959-60
49	*T. Thanikachalam Mudaliar, 13 Nara- singapuram Street, Madras-2. . . . .	Individual	5,500 5,500 5,300 5,600	1956-57 1957-58 1958-59 1959-60
<i>Madras-II.</i>				
50	Shri B. Muniappa Gounder, C/o. M/s. B.L.S. Motor Service, Met- tupalayam Road, Coimbatore . . . . .	Individual	24,000	1958-59
51	M/s. Baluswamy Naidu & Sons, Hides & Skins Merchant, Coimbatore . . . . .	Firm	10,000	1958-59
52	Shri C. Pullaru Chettiar, Somanur . . . . .	Individual	5,800 7,600	1961-62 1962-63
53	M/s. General Engineering Company, Patel Road, Coimbatore . . . . .	Registered Firm	16,000	1958-59
54	Mrs. Mangalammal, 11 Madurai Mudali St., Madras-2 . . . . .	Individual	9,300	1962-63
55	M/s. Murugan Transport (P) Ltd., Din- digul . . . . .	Company	13,500	1962-63
56	Shri Suresh Gokuldas, Vysial St., Coim- batore. . . . .	Hindu Undivided Family	6,153 8,620 9,233 5,719	1953-54 1954-55 1955-56 1956-57
57	Shri T. P. Rangaswamy Konar, Tiru- chirapalli . . . . .	Individual	6,000	1961-62
<i>Madras (Central)</i>				
58	Major L. Mahadeviah, " Gurura- ja Vilas", Harish Chandra Road, Mysore . . . . .	Individual	6,000	1960-61
59	Shri M. S. Ramiah, 22 Cubbon Road, Bangalore . . . . .	Individual	5,538	1960-61
60	M/s. Poddar Martin Mining Company & Minerals (P) Ltd., Bangalore . . . . .	Company	13,610	1960-61
<i>Mysore</i>				
61	Shri H. L. Nanjappa, 10 Kumara Park, West Bangalore . . . . .	Individual	6,500	1961-62
62	Shri N.T. Ambakki Gadag, Hubli . . . . .	Hindu Undivided Family	7,000	1961-62
63	Shri R. Rangappa Reddy New Thara- gupet, Bangalore-2 . . . . .	Hindu Undivided Family	5,000	1963-64

\*(The assessee is now dead).

1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
64	M/s. Srinivasa Weaving & Silk Throwing Factory, Bangalore . . . . .	Registered Firm	7,200	1963-64
65	M/s. V. C. P. Ramaswamy Chettiar & Co., A. S. Char Street, Bangalor-2 . . . . .	Registered Firm	6,000	1958-59
66	M/s. Venugopal Oil Traders, New Tharagupet, Bangalore . . . . .	Registered Firm	6,200	1964-65
67	M/s. Y. H. Venkataramanappa, Avenue Road, Bangalore . . . . .	Registered Firm	6,000	1962-63
68	M/s. Maharaj Mal Hansraj, Ghan-taghar, Amritsar . . . . .	Firm	15,206 11,814 9,996 6,672 5,589	1947-48 1948-49 1949-50 1952-53 1953-54
69	Lala Sain Das <i>alias</i> Bijli Individual Pehalwan Lawrence Road, Amritsar . . . . .	Individual	5,341 5,502 5,906 6,019 5,875 5,848 5,079 5,333 6,480 6,133 6,133 7,236 7,345 8,367	1944-45 1945-46 1946-47 1947-48 1948-49 1949-50 1950-51 1951-52 1952-53 1953-54 1954-55 1955-56 1956-57 1957-58
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>				
70	Dr. S. M. Gupta, P. L. Sharma Road, Meerut (at present, Anand-puri, Meerut) . . . . .	Individual	12,000	1962-63
<i>West Bengal-I</i>				
71	Shri J. C. Hui, 12B Netaji Subash Road, Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	40,000	1958-59
72	Shri N.N. Shah, 14 Bentick St., Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	8,400 5,200 5,600	1950-51 1951-52 1952-53
<i>West Bengal-II</i>				
73	Dr. Bimla Charan Law, 63 Radha-bazar, Street, Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	9,056	1962-63
74	M.s. Jankidas Shewnarayan, 48 Canning Street, Calcutta . . . . .	Registered Firm	10,000	1959-60
75	Shri Promode Kr. Sen, 31 B Southern Avenue, Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	20,000 11,000	1954-55 1957-58
<i>West Bengal-III</i>				
76	*Shri Bhagatram Bajoria, 1 Nabar-bagan St., Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	6,000	1958-59
77	Shri Bhudhumull Bhutoria C/o. Tripura Transport Co., 56 N. S. Road, Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	34,000	1958-59

\*(The assessee is now dead)

## SCHEDULE III

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the failure to file returns of income or to produce books of account during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1965, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1964-65.

Sr. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
<b>Bombay City—II</b>			Rs.	
1	M/s. Ebrahim Essabhai & Sons, 11 Old Hanuman Lane, Bombay	Registered Firm	5,160	1963-64
2	M/s. Majethia & Co., New Lane, B. C. Market, Bombay	Registered Firm	5,450	1961-62
3	Shri R. D. Shroff, Stadium House, V. N. Road, Bombay	Individual	17,617 16,738	1960-61 1961-62
<b>Bombay (Central)</b>				
4	Shri R. V. Dongre, 82 Meadows St., Bombay	Individual	5,220	1963-64
<b>Delhi</b>				
5	M/s. Dewan Chand Kuramal, Delhi	Hindu Undivided Family.	8,330	1957-58
<b>Rajasthan</b>				
6	M/s. Khemraj Buchilal, Raithal	Registered Firm	7,943	1961-62
7	Shri Maharaj Dhiraj Singh, Jodhpur	Individual	8,026	1958-59
8	M/s. Nagaur Charcoal Depot, Falna	Registered Firm	5,850	1960-61
9	M/s. Radha Vallabh & Sons, Jaipur	Registered Firm	7,086	1959-60
10	M/s. Sunehilal Jainarain Bhilwara	Registered Firm	6,060 6,300	1958-59 1959-60
<b>Kerala</b>				
11	M/s. C. Moidu Merchants, Tellicherry	Registered Firm	7,815	1961-62
12	Smt. P. Narayani Amma, Nadakkal House, Badagara	Individual	13,459	1958-59
<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>				
13	M/s. Shamaldas Devchand Lashkar	Registered Firm	5,002	1958-59
14	M/s. United Transport Co. Pvt. Ltd., Naya Bazar, Lashkar	Company	5,000	1960-61
<b>Madras-II</b>				
15	Shri V. K. Velan, 142 Saligramam, Madras-26	Individual	12,384	1960-61
<b>Madras-</b>				
16	Shri P. Anwar Basha Sahib, 27 Sydenhams Road, Madras	Individual	7,403	1961-62
17	Shri T. Nissar Ahmed, 19 Vepery High Road, Madras	Individual	15,173	1963-64
18	Shri V. S. Sivasubramanian Tiruppur	Individual	6,570	1962-63

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Madras Central</i>				
19	Shri M. S. Ramiah, 22 Cubbon Road, Bangalore . . . . .	Individual	38,002	1961-62
<i>Poona</i>				
20	Shri B. D. Mehudiratta, 68 Koregaon Park, Poona . . . . .	Individual	29,972	1960-61
21	M/s. Bombay Construction Co., 6 Yervada . . . . .	Registered Firm	11,607	1960-61
22	Shri C. R. Mehudiratta, 2 Koregaon Park, Poona . . . . .	Individual	34,294	1960-61
23	Smt. Kamalabhai H. Pandya, 1 Bhavanipet, Poona . . . . .	Individual	5,111	1960-61
<i>Punjab</i>				
24	M/s. Kishorilal Sunderlal, Yamuna-nagar . . . . .	Firm	11,932	1958-59
<i>West Bengal-I</i>				
25	Shri B. P. Coomer, 11 Convent Road, Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	9,997	1958-59
<i>West Bengal—II</i>				
26	Dr. Bimala Charan Law, 63 Radha-bazar St., Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	30,888	1962-63
27	M/s. Calcutta Supply Agency, 8 Canning Street, Calcutta . . . . .	Registered Firm	8,563	1960-61
28	Dr. Satya Charan Law, 63 Radha-bazar, St. Calcutta . . . . .	Registered Firm	16,840	1960-61
<i>West Bengal—III</i>				
29	M/s. Wooma Charan Karmarkar, 161 N. S. Road, Calcutta . . . . .	Registered Firm	6,710	1963-64
<i>Calcutta (Central)</i>				
30	Smt. Chandbhai Bajoria, 212 Corn-wallis St., Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	7,288	1952-53
31	Shri Haridas Munjra, 26 P. K. Tagore St., Calcutta . . . . .	Individual	15,33,000 15,33,157	1958-59 1959-60

## SCHEDULE IV

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the non-payment of tax during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1965 where first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1964-65.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year relation to which the default occurred
			Rs.	
<i>Bombay (Central)</i>				
1.	Shri Shivji Liladhar, 334, Samuel St., Bombay . . . . .	Individual	13,196 65,981	1959-60

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Kerala</i>			Rs.	
2.	M/s. R.K.V. Motors & Timbers (P) Ltd., Trivandrum.	Company	5,000	1965-66
3.	Shri V. Damodaran, Mg. Director, M/s. R.K.V. Motors & Timbers (P) Ltd., Trivandrum.	Individual	8,000 10,000 7,004	1962-63 1963-64 1965-66
<i>Madhya Pradesh</i>				
4.	Shri Ranchodbhal, Prop: of Jagdish Lal Kanahiyalal, Baniria.	Individual	7,000	1958-59
<i>Madras (Central)</i>				
5.	M/s. Babukhan & Sons., Secunderabad.	Unregistered Firm	9,150 9,150	1951-52 1952-53
<i>Punjab</i>				
6.	Shri Mothu Ram C/o M/s. Mothuram Premchand, Ludhiana.	Individual	5,000	1962-6
<i>Uttar Pradesh</i>				
7.	M/s. Saru Smelting & Refining Corpn. Ltd., Meerut.	Company	12,270	1963-64
<i>West Bengal-I</i>				
8.	M/s. Publicity Society of India Ltd., 1 Waterloo Street, Calcutta.	Company	34,998	1964-65
<i>West Bengal-II</i>				
9.	M/s. Nimcha Coal Co. Ltd., 21 Jatindra N. Avenue, Calcutta.	Company	10,000	1964-65
<i>West Bengal-III</i>				
10.	M/s. Diamond Sugar Mills Ltd., 4-E, Dalhousie Square, Calcutta.	Company	5,500	1961-62

[No. 5 (F. No. 58/85/67-IT(Inv).]

**S.O. 396.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary and expedient in public interest to publish the names and other particulars relating to the assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000 was imposed:—

- for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1965, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66;
- for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1965 and ending with 31st March, 1966, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of;
- for the failure to file returns of income or to produce books of account during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1966, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66;
- for the non-payment of tax during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1966 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66; and

- (e) for other defaults such as failure to pay tax deducted at source from dividends during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1966, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66;

Now therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 287 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Government hereby publishes, in Schedules I to V hereto annexed, the names and other particulars of the assessee aforesaid.

#### SCHEDULE I

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1965 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>			Rs.	
1.	M/s. Kantipudi Subbarao & Co., Rajahmundry.	Registered Firm	7,500	1961-62
2.	M/s. Navayuga Traders Gunny Firm, Rajahmundry	Registered Firm	22,000	1961-62
<i>Bombay City-II</i>				
3.	M/s. D. Manilal & Co., 52-58, New Hanuman Lane, Bombay.	Registered Firm	5,145	1960-61
4.	Ramkumar Jwaladutt, 305 Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.	Registered Firm	15,000	1958-59
<i>Bombay City-III</i>				
5.	M/s. J. K. Investors Co. (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd., Bombay.	Company	7,000	1962-63
<i>Kerala</i>				
6.	M/s. D'cruz Brothers, Contractors, Quilon.	Registered Firm	10,063	1958-59
7.	M/s. M. Shamsuddin, Standard Oil Mills, Quilon.	Individual	14,368 26,036	1962-63 1963-64
8.	M/s. S. R. K. V. Tile Works, Quilon	Registered Firm	6,500	1963-64
9.	M/s. V. K. Kuruen & K.P. George, Kolencherry.	Unregistered Firm	14,107	1961-62
<i>Madras-I</i>				
10.	Shri S. K. S. Rajamani Nadar, South Rajash Street, Tuticorin	Individual	5,000	1958-59
<i>Madras (Central).</i>				
11.	Shri Narayana Setty, Partner M/s. Shankaranarayana Const. Co., Kar-gel.	Individual	8,473	1961-62
<i>Mysore</i>				
12.	M/s. Sri Krishna Auto Sales & Service Corpn., B.H. Road, Shimoga.	Registered Firm	6,000	1962-63
<i>Punjab</i>				
13.	M/s. Jamna Auto Industries, Yamuna-nagar.	Registered Firm	10,000	1960-61

1	2	3	4	5
	<i>West Bengal-II</i>		Rs.	
14.	M/s. Calcutta Supply Agency, 8 Canning Street, Calcutta.	Registered Firm	8,563	1960-61
	<i>Calcutta (Central)</i>			
15.	M/s. Ganeshbarrie Tea Co. (Pvt.) Ltd., P-8, Mission Row Extn., Calcutta.	Company	12,000	1959-60
16.	M/s. Gillapukri Tea & Seeds Co. Ltd., P-8, Mission Row Extn., Calcutta.	Company	16,000	1958-59
17.	M/s. Mannabarrie Tea Co. Ltd., P-8, Mission Row, Extn., Calcutta.	Company	5,500	1961-62
18.	M/s. Sapoi Tea Co. Ltd., P-8, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta.	Company	15,000	1959-60
19.	M/s. Shell Co. of India Ltd., C/O. Burmah Shell, Ballard Estate, Bombay.	Company	2,00,000	1963-64

SCHEDULE II

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for the concealment of income during the period commencing with 1st April, 1965 and ending with 31st March, 1966 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of.

SL No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
	<i>Bombay City-I</i>		Rs.	
1.	Shri A. R. Zamindar, Navshakthi Films, Famous Cine Building, Bombay-II.	Individual	5,400	1959-60
			5,400	1960-61
2.	M/s. B. R. Herman & Mohastas (India) Pvt. Ltd., Mustaffa Building, Sir, P.M. Road, Bombay-I.	Company	19,261	1959-60
3.	Shri J. C. Gupta, Gul Mansion, Marine Drive, Bombay.	Individual	32,000	1960-61
4.	M/s. Sajjanlal Javerilal & Co., 54, Sk. Memon St., Bombay.	Hindu Undivided Family	35,755	1955-56
			37,484	1956-57
			30,752	1957-58
			31,835	1958-59
			31,860	1959-60
			18,197	1960-61
5.	Shri Sheikh Mukhtar, 310 Famous Cine Building, Bombay-II.	Individual	92,000	1960-61
6.	M/s. Standard Paint, Oil & Colour Co. (P) Ltd., 2 Navroji Hill Road, Bombay-9.	Company	9,566	1956-57
			15,483	1958-59
7.	M/s. Tara Sarup, Kermani Building, r. D.N. Road, Bombay.	Individual	7,000	1962-63
	M/s. Tata Fisons (Pt) Ltd., Bombay House, Bruce Street, Bombay.	Company	10,000	1961-62
			16,000	1962-63
9.	M/s. Telechome Industries Pvt. Ltd., 71, Govt. Gate Road, Parel, Bombay. j	Company	7,	

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Bombay City-II</i>			Rs.	
10	Shri Balkrishna Khosla, 3, Narayan Dhru Street, Bombay.	Individual	7,000	1960-61
11	M/s. Bharat Industrial Corporation, Grant Road, Bombay.	Registered Firm	5,327	1957-58
			3,052	1958-59
12	M/s. Chandumal Mandal (Cloth Depot) 131-2 Radha Galli, Swadeshi Mkt., Bombay.	Registered Firm	6,134	1960-61
			7,243	1961-62
			8,731	1962-63
13	Shri Harlal Brijlal Grover, Prop. Devindra Cycle Co., 404-A Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.	Individual	38,350	1960-61
14	Shri Hiralal Chhaganlal, Stock Exchange Building, Dalal Street, Bombay.	Individual	14,182	1954-55
			1,62,333	1955-56
			1,06,587	1956-57
15	M/s. Impex Watch Co., 38 Abdul Rehman Street, Bombay.	Registered Firm	5,000	1960-61
16	M/s. Jivakuka & Co., Votjivan Mansion, Princes St., Bombay.	Registered Firm	23,748	1960-61
17	Metals, P t Ltd., Reliance Bldg., 209, Dr. D. N. Road, Bombay-I.	Company	6,000	1959-60
18	Premi Haridas & Co., 168-170, Argyle Road, Bombay.	Registered Firm	16,146	1954-55
<i>Bombay City-III</i>				
19	M/s. A. G. Bookwalla, 9/13 Mirza Street, Bombay.	Registered Firm	5,620	1957-58
			8,530	1959-60
20	Shri A. R. Dohia, Prop. Dhoia Traders, Commercial Chambers, Masjid Bunder Road, Bombay-3	Individual	6,228	1961-62
21	K. C. Shah, Prop. Universal Agencies, 16-18, Champagally, Bombay.	Individual	17,000	1959-60
22	M/s. Kirtikumar Chandulal & Co., 313 Samuel Street, Bombay.	Registered Firm	6,292	1956-57
			5,460	1957-58
			5,610	1958-59
23	M/s. Lalitkumar H. Thakkar 2nd Fana-swadi, Bombay.	Registered Firm	5,000	1961-62
<i>Bombay (Central).—</i>				
24	Shri B. K. Mansetta, C/o, M/s. N. Mansetta Bros. 165 Lohar Chawal, Bombay.	Individual	7,877	1952-53
25	*Chimanlal C. Desai, Gool Mansion, Homji Street, Bombay.	Individual	43,000	1959-60
26	M/s. Jaymes Engineering Co., Warden House, Sir P. M. Road, Bombay	Registered Firm	5,00,643	1959-60
			2,54,120	1960-61
27	Shri M. S. Nathwani, C/o M/s. Kala Niketan, 95-A Queens Road, Bombay.	Individual	7,240	1960-61
28	M/s. R. N. Rustomji & Co., Srinivas House, Outram Road, Bombay.	Registered Firm	6,150	1959-60
29	M/s. Sadhna Textiles Mills Pvt. Ltd., Sadhna Rayon House, D. N. Road, Bombay.	Company	22,125	1959-60
30	M/s. Shree Commercial Traders (P) Ltd., 33 Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.	Company	1,81,000	1959-60
31	M/s. Shreeram Durgaprasad (R. B.) & Fatechand Narsingdas (Export), Tumsar.	Registered Firm	24,804	1959-60
<i>Delhi (Central)</i>				
32	S. G. Prinder Singh Kairon, Amritsar.	Individual	10,678	1960-61
			6,419	1961-62
			33,268	1962-63
			12,583	1963-64
			17,403	
			8,143	
			23,295	1964-65
			9,854	



1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
33	S. Surinder Singh Kairon, Amritsar	Individual	24,375 9,048 48,622 20,272 30,057 17,814 18,716 14,984 1,01,942	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63 1963-64 1964-65
<i>Gujarat—I.</i>				
34	Shri Fidahusseini N. Merchant, Hill Drive, Bhavnagar.	Individual	5,362	1956-57
35	Shri Chunilal Virchand, Rapar,	Individual	12,000 5,000 6,661 5,753 5,650 7,243 5,544 5,800 5,930	1957-58 1959-60 1957-58 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63 1964-65 1959-60
36	Shri Raman Lal Amritlal, Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad.	Individual		
37	Shri Ramji Parshottam, Porbandar	Individual		
<i>Gujarat—II.</i>				
38	M/s. Babulal Laxmichand, Chakor, Bazar, Ahmedabad.	Registered Firm	12,735	1956-57
39	M/s. Gum Products (India) Panch - Kuwa, Ahmedabad.	Registered Firm	10,600 10,780 5,408	1960-61 1961-62 1963-64
40	M/s. Jagat Bipin & Co., Kadia-Kui Relief Road, Kalupur, Ahmedabad.	Registered Firm		
41	M/s. Maneklal Premchand, New Cloth Market, Ahmedabad.	Registered Firm	65,000 80,272 77,000 12,290 12,129	1961-62 1962-63 1963-64 1955-56 1958-59
42	Shri Mohanlal V. Bunki, Sagrampura, Zunda Shori, Surat.	Individual		
<i>Kerala</i>				
43	M/s. K. Prameswaran Pillai, Chashew Exporters, Quilon.	Registered Firm	15,786 17,328 15,926 15,232 16,000 16,325 30,973	1956-57 1957-58 1958-59 1959-60 1960-61 1961-62 1962-63
<i>Madhya Pradesh—(Nagpur).</i>				
44	M/s. Basumal Rupchand, Katni	Hindu Undivided Family.	10,000	1959-60
45	M/s. Mohd. Ikram Abdul Wahced & Co., Naya Mohalla, Jabalpur.	Registered Firm	25,000	1959-60
<i>Madras—I.</i>				
46	*Late Shri A. Modalianda Mudaliar, Bharathi Bus Service, Sholinghar.	Individual	8,701	1962-63
47	Shri A. K. Lakshmanan, 12, 3rd Panthadi Street, Madurai.	Hindu Undivided Family.	9,000	1953-64
48	M/s. Elite Opticals Industries, 4, Broadway, Madras-1.	Registered Firm	6,000	1964-65
49	Kum. L. Vijayalaxmi, 16, 3rd Main Street, Madras-18.	Individual	5,000	1963-64
50	Shri P. V. Mohammed Ghouse Ramnad Road, Madurai.	Individual	13,500	1958-59

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Madras—II.</i>			Rs.	
51	Shri T. V. Vectappa Chettiar Tfruchira-Indivual pali.		10,000	1962-63
<i>Madras—(Central).</i>				
52	M/s Poddar Martin Mining & Mine- rals, Ltd., (New known as M/s. Hosadurga Mining Co. Ltd.) Bangalore.	Company	90,000	1959-60.
53	M/s Sivaji Films (P) Ltd., Madras.	Compap	5,737 9,962	1960-61 1961-62
<i>Mysore</i>				
54	Shri C. S. Shankarappa, Cubbonpet, Bangalore.	Individual	6,492	1958-59
55	M/s. G. M. Bassappa & Sons, Mondipet, Tumkur.	Registered Firm	6,027 5,400	1959-60 1964-65
56	M/s. H. Nanjundappa & Bros. Godown Street, Bangalore	Hindu Undivided Family.	6 089	1962-63
57	Shri H. L. Nawjappa, 10 Kumara Park, Bangalore.	Individual	5,000	1962-6 3
58	M/s. Hotchand Asardas, D. K. Lane, Bangalore.	Registered Firm	5,000	1963-64
59	Shri M. Muthukrishna, C/o. M/s. M. K. Engineering Works, Industrial Estate, Rajajanagar, Bangalore.	Individual	14,850 5,050	1963-64 1964-65
60	Shri S. M. M. Ahmed Faook, 11-A, Commercial Street, Bangalore-1	Individual	19,030	1964-65
61	M/s. Saraswathi Iron Foundry, Magadi Road, Bangalore.	Registered Firm	5,070	1963-64
<i>Poona</i>				
62	M/s. A. S. Rahimatulla, 1174, Raviwar Peth, Poona.	Registered Firm	12,898	1960-61
63	M/s. A. V. Gandhi, 776 Budhwar Peth, Poona.	Registered Firm	5,000	1959-60.
<i>Punjab</i>				
64	M/s. Dillo Ram & Co., Mandi	Registered Firm	7,500	1964-65
65	M/s. Khemchand Vijaykumar, Tanda Road, Jullundur.	Registered Firm	16,305 5,313 8,311 33,990 6,472	1959-60 1961-62 1963-64 1964-65 1959-60.
66	M/s. Kirpa Ram Radha Kishan, Ludhiana.	Registered Firm		
67	M/s. Punjab Steel Rolling Mills, Govind garh.	Registered Firm	7,500	1961-62
68	M/s. Sawaya Mal Sant Ram, Chandigarh, C/o Shri Kundan Lal, Advocate Saban Bazar, Ludhiana.	Registered Firm	7,000	199-60
<i>Rajasthan</i>				
69	M/s. Balchand Poonamchand, Karta Poonamchand, Khazana Gali, Ajmer.	Hindu Undivided Family.	7,000	1959-60.
70	M/s. Bundi Electric Supply Co. Ltd., Bundi.	Company	6,000	1960-61
<i>Uttar Pradesh—I &amp; II.</i>				
71	M/s. Hiralal Natha Bhai, Badshahi Naka, Kanpur.	Registered Firm	7,250 7,400	1960-61 1961-62
72	Rani Kaniz Abida Begum, Sitapur.	Individual	7,450	1962-63

1	2	3	4	5
<i>West Bengal-II</i>			Rs.	
73	M/s. Calcutta Safe Deposits Co. Ltd., 23-B.N.S. Road, Calcutta.	Company	7,800	1962-63
74	Mr. F. G. Shoobridge, C/o French Motor Co. Ltd., 234/3 Lower Circular Road, Calcutta.	Individual	5,300 75,000	1963-64 1958-59
75	M/s India Diesel Service, 138, Canning St., Calcutta.	Registered Firm	5,200	1950-60
76	M/s. Lalji Raja & Sons, Bankura.	Registered Firm.	19,000 19,000 17,000	1959-60 1960-61 1961-62
77	Shri Manikchand Gupta, Prop. M/s. Annapurna Bhandar, 38, Rani Rashmoni Road, Calcutta-13.	Individual	6,000	1962-63
78	M/s. Mitra Mukherjee & Co., 18 N. S. Road, Calcutta.	Registered Firm.	5,425	1959-60
79	Dr. N. Dutta, 39, Ramananda Chatterjee St., Calcutta.	Individual	17,190	1962-63
80	M/s. Sorpi Kajora Coal Mines (P) Ltd., 35, Canning St., Calcutta.	Company	7,554	1960-61
81	Mr. Stanley Howard, 27, Marquis St., Calcutta.	Individual	6,000	1960-61
82	Shri Wong King Kao, P-39, Mission Row Extension, Calcutta	Individual	9,000	1961-62
<i>West Bengal-III</i>				
83	Shri Alamohan Das, 29 Strand Road, Calcutta.	Individual	6,000	1954-55
84	Shri Chandradee Singh, 113, Manohar-das St., Calcutta.	Individual	8,500	1958-59
85	M/s. Himal Traders Pvt. Ltd., 6, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.	Company	13,000	1959-60
86	Shri Siddique Ismail, 113, Lower Chitpur Road, Calcutta.	Individual	6,500	1959-60
<i>Calcutta (Central)</i>				
88	Jit Paul, 135, Canning St., Calcutta	Individual	6,911	1959-60
88	M/s. Steel Crate (P) Ltd., 3, Dinshaw Wacha Road, Calcutta.	Company.	22,500	1959-60
89	M/s. Steel Rolling Mills of Hindustan, Pvt. Ltd., 135, Canning Street, Calcutta.	Company.	70,785 38,070	1959-60 1960-61

\*The assessee is dead.

### SCHEDULE III

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for failure to file return of income or to produce books of accounts during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1966, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which the default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
<i>Andhra Pradesh</i>			Rs.	
1	M/s. Mirza Zamin Ali, P.W.D. Contractors, outside Daberpura, Hyderabad.	Registered Firm.	5,288	1964-65

1	2	3	4	5
<i>Bombay City-II</i>			Rs.	
2	Sir Couwasji Jehangir, Bart II Ready Individual. Mansion, V. N. Road, Bombay.	.	28,900	1961-62
3	M/s. Dave Shah & Co., Picket Road, Registered Firm Bombay.	.	7,322	1961-62
<i>Bombay City-III</i>				
4	M/s. A. Ismail & Co. (P) Ltd., Kashinath Company Chawal, Hill Road, Bandra, Bombay.	.	6,350	1961-62
5	Shri K. C. Shah, Universal Agencies, Individual. 16-18, Champagalli, Bombay.	.	31,300 } 8,750 }	1959-60
6	Shri Raghunath Prabhudayal Obhan, Individual. Prop. Obhan Transport Co., Raichur Street, Bombay.	.	5,841	1961-62
<i>Bombay (Central)</i>				
7	M/s. Shree Commercial Traders (P) Ltd., Company 333, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay.	.	50,000	1959-60
<i>Delhi (Central)</i>				
8	Shri Bipon Behari Lal Kutlhiala, Simla Hindu Undivided Family.	.	12,700	1958-59
9	Shri Gurinder Singh Kairon, Amritsar. Individual.	.	25,565 26,736 16,548	1961-62 1962-63 1963-64
10	Rai Bahadur Jodha Mal Kuthiala & Sons, Simla. Registered Firm	.	15,535	1958-59
11	Shri R. N. Aggarwal, 165, Jor Bagh, Individual. New Delhi.	.	1,79,736 } 64,705 }	1958-59
12	Shri Surinder Singh Kairon, Amritsar. Individual.	.	8,558 1,06,426 47,770 19,979	1958-59 1961-62 1962-63 1963-64
<i>Gujarat-I</i>				
13	Shri Fidahusseini N. Merchant, Hill Drive, Bhavnagar. Individual	.	12,854	1954-55
<i>Gujarat-II</i>				
14	M/s. D. Harishankar Dhanjibhai Kelapith, Surat. Unregistered Firm	.	5,269	1963-64
<i>Kerala</i>				
15	M/s. Dawn & Co., Quilon. Registered Firm.	.	5,166	1963-64
16	M/s. Kerala Janatha, Printers and Publishers Ltd., Trivandrum. Company.	.	5,670	1961-62
17	Shri P. V. Devassy, Partner, St. George's Oil, Flour & Rice Mills Ltd., Irinjalakuda. Individual	.	14,650	1958-59
18	Shri T. M. Mathai, Mukaluvila Puthen Veedu, Pazhaya Theruvu, Kottarakkara. Individual	.	6,870	1960-61
<i>Nagpur</i>				
19	M/s. Bhikamchand Naraindas, Dhamtari Raipur. Registered Firm.	.	10,044	1960-61
20	M/s. Chhaganbhai Purshottamdas, Jabalpur. Registered Firm.	.	16,850	1959-60

1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
21	M/s. Harnamsingh & Sons, Indore.	Registered Firm.	5,200	1959-60
22	M/s. India Thermit Corpn., Ltd., Lashkar, Gwalior.	Company	23,660	1963-64
23	M/s. Mohd. Ikram Abdul Waheed & Co., Naya Mohalla, Jabalpur.	Registered Firm.	5,000	1959-60
24	Shri Jainarain Singh, Dalal, Raipur.	Individual.	5,785	1959-60
25	M/s. Premraj Mangalchand.	Hindu Undivided Family.	8,942	1961-62
26	M/s. Takatmal Sethi & Co., Bhopal.	Registered Firm.	10,290	1959-60
27	M/s. United Transport Co. (P) Ltd., Lashkar, Gwalior.	Company.	6,756	1961-62

*Madras-II*

28	M/s. N. B. Abdul Gator, Trichirapalli.	Registered Firm.	9,708	1963-64
----	--	------------------	-------	---------

*Madras (Central)*

29	A. K. Babukhan, C/o M/s. Babukhan & Sons, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Secunderabad.	Individual.	6,017	1963-64
30	Shri Kapurchand Shrimall, Shares & Finance Brokers, Sultan Bazar, Hyderabad.	Individual.	1,30,634	1959-60

*Mysore*

31	M/s. Boriah Basaviah & Sons, Mysore.	Registered Firm.	37,317	1961-62
32	M/s. K. Ramakrishna Reddy & Co., P.W.D. Contractor, Marki.	Registered Firm.	6,361	1962-63
33	Shri S. L. Lobo, Partner: Modern Tile Works, B.C. Road, P.O. Bantawal.	Individual.	8,030	1963-64
34	M/s. V. P. Raman & Co., A. S. Char Street, Bangalore.	Registered Firm.	15,962	1961-62
35	Shri V. P. Rasquinha, Partner: Modern Tile Works, B.C. Road, P.O. Bantawal.	Individual.	7,565	1963-64

*Poona*

36	M/s. Chotalal Welshibhai, Kolhapur.	Unregistered Firm.	5,295	1961-62
----	-------------------------------------	--------------------	-------	---------

*Punjab*

37	M/s. B. Johar Forests Works, Jammu	Association of persons.	16,924	1959-60
38	M/s. Khemchand Vijaykumar, Tanda Road, Jullundur.	Registered Firm.	24,366	1958-59
			21,714	1960-61
			12,836	1961-62
39	M/s. Sant Singh & Co., College Road, Path t.	Registered Firm.	10,040	1961-62

*Rajasthan*

40	M/s. Bhanwar Lal Goyal, Photo Wala, Ajmer.	Registered Firm.	5,717	1961-62
----	--	------------------	-------	---------

*West Bengal-I*

41	M/s. Calcutta Import Agency, 28/4, Convent Road, Calcutta.	Unregistered Firm.	6,930	1961-62
			6,966	1962-63
42	M/s. Eastern Engg. Corpn., 1/1/B, Beninandan St., Calcutta.	Unregistered Firm.	6,862	1959-60
4	M/s. Sen Singh & Co., 1/1/B, Beninandan St., Calcutta.	Unregistered Firm.	9,117	1955-56
			5,706	1956-57

1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
<i>West Bengal-II*</i>				
44	Shri Nirmal Ch. Addy, C/o., M/s. Addy Pyne & Sons, 30, Strand Road, Calcutta.	Individual.	9,256	1961-62
45	M/s. Nava Bharat Commercial Corporation, 16, K.K. Tagore St., Calcutta.	Unregistered Firm.	8,148	1959-60
<i>West Bengal-III.</i>				
46	Shri Muralidhar Khandelwal, 13, Portuguese Church St., Calcutta.	Individual.	5,750	1960-61
47	M/s. Himat Traders (P) Ltd., 6, Old Post Office St., Calcutta.	Company.	6,900	1961-62
<i>Calcutta (Central)</i>				
48	Sri Anandilal Saraf, Prop. India Coal Tar Supply Co., 208, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta.	Individual.	6,665 6,310	1960-61

## SCHEDULE IV

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for non-payment of tax during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 and ending with 31st March, 1966 where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty	Assessment year in relation to which default occurred
1	2	3	4	5
<i>Bombay City-I</i>				
			Rs.	
1	M/s. Alcock Ashdown & Co. Ltd., 16 Bank Street, Bombay	Company	15,000	1966-67
<i>Bombay City-II</i>				
2	Shri M. P. Laud, High Court, Bombay	Individual	5,000	1965-66
3	Shri R. M. Mehta C/o Ratilal & Sons, Cotton Exchange Building, Bombay	Individual	5,000	1957-58
<i>Bombay City-III</i>				
4	M/s. Grauer & Weil (I) Pvt. Ltd., Sukh Sagar, Bombay-7.	Company	6,000	1964-65
5	M/s. Indian National Press (Bombay) Pvt. Ltd., 21, Dalal St. Bombay	Company	7,500	1963-64
6	M/s. Sawhney Finance Pvt. Ltd., 91, Mohamad Ali Road, Bombay	Company	8,500	1960-61
<i>Bombay (Central)</i>				
7	M/s. Bharat Barrel & Drum Mfg. Co. (P) Ltd., 139, Meadows St., Bombay	Company	15,000	1966-67

1	2	3	4	5
			Rs.	
8	M/s. Edward Textiles Ltd., 15 Daugal Rd., Ballard Estate, Bombay	Company	10,000	1960-61
9	M/s. Harinagar Sugar Mills 207, Kalbadevi Road, Bombay	Company	13,000 25,000	1966-67
10	M/s. Indore Malwa United Mills Ltd., 139 Meadows Street, Bombay	Company]	6,600	1965-66
11	M/s. Narayan Hosiery Pvt. Ltd., 139 Meadows Street, Bombay	Company]	₹5,000	1964-65
<b>Delhi (Central)</b>				
12	Shri R. N. Agarwal, 165, Jor Bagh, New Delhi	Individual	₹9,500	1959-60
13	M/s. Oriental Building & Furnishing Co. Pvt. Ltd. Con. Circus, New Delhi	Company	15,000	1958-59
<b>Kerala</b>				
14	M/s. Indo Marine Agencies Cochin	Registered Firm	6,300	1963-64
15	Shri M. Paul Mathew Alwaye	Individual	5,078	1964-65
16	M/s. Malabar Agricultural Co. Ltd., Kottayam	Company	5,000	1962-63
17	M/s. Paratex Corporation Ltd., Kottayam	Company]	6,000 5,000	1962-63 1963-64
18	M/s. R. K. V. Motors & Timbers (P) Ltd., Trivandrum	Company	5,300	1966-67
19	M/s. Standard Motor Union (P) Ltd., Ettumanoor	Company	5,000	1964-65
<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>				
20	M/s. Chamialal Umaji & Sons, M. T. Cloth Market, Indore	Registered Firm	5,000	1960-61
<b>Punjab.</b>				
21	M/s. Panipat Woollen & General Mills Ltd., Kharar	Company]	7,000	1965-66
<b>West Bengal-I</b>				
22	M/s. Arbind Bros. (P) Ltd., 4, Saklat Place, Calcutta-13	Company	10,000	1964-65
23	M/s. Asiatic Oxygen & Acetylene Co. Ltd., 3, Dalhousie, Sq., East, Calcutta	Company	20,000	1966-67
24	M/s. G. Atherton & Co. (P) Ltd. 21, Rajendra Nath Mukherjee Road, Calcutta	Company	5,000 11,933	1964-65 1966-67
<b>West Bengal-II</b>				
25	M/s. Lamp House, 23 Canning St., Calcutta	Unregistered Firm	10,999	1960-61
26	M/s. Shiva Glass Works Ltd., 23/24, Radhabazar, St., Calcutta	Company	20,025	1960-61

## SCHEDULE V

Assessee on whom a penalty of not less than Rs. 5,000/- was imposed for other defaults such as failure to pay tax deducted at source from dividends during the period commencing with 1st April, 1960 to 31st March, 1966, where no first appeal was presented within the time allowed therefor or where the first appeals presented have been disposed of during the financial year 1965-66.

Sl. No.	Name and address of the assessee	Status	Amount of penalty Rs.	Assessment year in relation to which default occurred
	<i>Mysore.</i>			
1	M/s. Steel Construction Co. (P) Ltd., Hardinge Road, Bangalore	Company	8,509	1965-66

[No. 6/F. No. 58/90/67-IT(Inv)].

G. S. SRIVASTAVA, Jt. Secy.

## (Department of Revenue &amp; Insurance)

## STAMPS

New Delhi, the 27th January 1968

S.O. 397.—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the stamp duty with which the bonds to the value of seven lakhs of rupees to be issued by the Himachal Pradesh Financial Corporation are chargeable under the said Act.

[No. 3/68—F. No. 1/2/68-Cus. VII/Stamp].

M. S. SUBRAMANYAM, Under Secy.

## MINISTRY OF COMMERCE

New Delhi, the 17th January 1968

S.O. 398.—The Government of Andhra Pradesh having nominated the Director of Handlooms and Textiles, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, to be a member of the Central Silk Board under clause (g) of sub-section (3) of section 4 of the Central Silk Board Act, 1948 (61 of 1948), in place of Sericulture Expert, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce No. 1272, dated the 10th April, 1967, namely:—

In the said notification, for the entry against serial number 16, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"16. Director of Handlooms and Textiles, Government of Andhra Pradesh, Hyderabad."

[No. F. 22/1/67-Tex(F).]

DAULAT RAM, Under Secy.



## (Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

## ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 13th November 1967*

**S.O. 399.**—A licence No. P/RM/2160269, dated 10th August 1967 of the value of Rs. 1,69,847.00 for import of Raw materials etc. falling under ITC 290/IV was issued to M/s. Bensons Industries, Ghoshpura-2, Opp. Patali Hanuman, Gwalior (Madhya Pradesh).

2. Thereafter, a show cause notice No. 118/HQ/67/Enl/4348, dated 18th October 1967 was issued asking them to show cause within Ten (10) days as to why the said licence in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same was obtained on the basis of forged recommendation of D.G.T.D. in terms of Clause 9(a)

3. In response to the aforesaid show cause notice, no reply has been received from M/s. Bensons Industries, Gwalior.

4. The undersigned has carefully examined the case and has come to the conclusion that the party have no defence to urge and have avoided a reply.

5. Having regard to what has been stated in the preceding paragraph, the undersigned is satisfied that the licence in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned, in exercise of the powers vested in him under Clause 9(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 hereby cancel the licence No. P/RM/2160269, dated 16th August 1967 for Rs. 1,69,847.00 issued in favour of M/s. Bensons Industries Ghoshpura-2, Opp. Patali Hanuman, Gwalior (M.P.)

To,

M/s. Bensons Industries,  
Ghoshpura-2, Opp. Patali Hanuman,  
Gwalior (M.P.).

[No. 118/HQ/67/Enl/4921]

*New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968*

**S.O. 400.**—It has been reported by M/s. Pioneer Chromate Works, Bombay that the Exchange Control Copy of the licence No. P/RM/2150805/C/XX/23/C/H/21-22 dated 22nd June 1966 granted to them for a value of Rs. 1,18,125 has been misplaced by them. They have applied for duplicate copy of the said licence. It has been further noted by the firm that the licence was registered with the Bombay customs.

In support of this contention M/s. Pioneer Chromate Works, Bombay have produced an Affidavit. I am satisfied that the original Exchange Control copy of the licence No. P/RM/2150805/C/XX/23/C/H/21-22 dated 22nd June, 1966 has been lost/misplaced and direct that duplicate licence for Exchange Control purposes only should be issued to M/s. Pioneer Chromate Works, Bombay.

The original Exchange Control Copy of the licence is hereby cancelled.

[No. CH/1(51)/A-M66/RM3/3903.]

**S.O. 401.**—It has been reported by M/s. Khandelwal Glass Works (Sasni) that both the copies of licence No. P/RM/2155744/C/XX/24/C/H/23-24, dated 28th December 1966 granted to them for a value of Rs. 10,000 have been misplaced by them. They have applied for duplicate copy of the said licence. It has been further stated by the licensee that the licence was lost at the Customs House, Calcutta.

In support of this contention M/s. Khandelwal Glass Works 'Sasni' have forwarded an affidavit. I am satisfied with the same that both the copies have been lost and direct that the duplicate copies of the licence (both the exchange/customs purposes) should be issued to M/s. Khandelwal Glass Works, Sasni.

[No. Glass 1-2(53)AM 67/RM 3/3905.]

P. C. VERMA,

Deputy Chief Controller of Imports & Exports.

## (Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)

## ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 13th November 1967*

**S.O. 402.**—A licence No. PRM/2159893/C/XX/25/C/H/23-24, dated 24th June 1967 of the value of Rs. 1,69,245.00 for import of parts and accessories was issued to M/s. Bensons Industries, Ghoshpura-2, Opp. Patali Hanuman, Gwalior (M.P.).

2. Thereafter, a show cause notice No. 118/HQ/67/Enf/4259, dated 16th October 1967 was issued asking them to show cause within ten (10) days as to why the said licence in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same was obtained on the basis of forged recommendation of D.G.T.D. in terms of Clause 9(a).

3. In response to the aforesaid show cause notice, no reply has been received from M/s. Bensons Industries, Gwalior (M.P.).

4. The undersigned has carefully examined the case and has come to the conclusion that the party have no defence to urge and have avoided a reply.

5. Having regard to what has been stated in the preceding paragraph, the undersigned is satisfied that the licence in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned, in exercise of the powers vested in him under Clause 9(a) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1958 hereby cancel the licence No. PRM/2159893/C/XX/25/C/H/23-24, dated 24th June 1967 for Rs. 1,69,245.00 issued in favour of M/s. Bensons Industries, Ghoshpura-2, Opp. Patali Hanuman, Gwalior (MP).

To,

M/s. Bensons Industries,  
Ghoshpura-2, Opp. Patali Hanuman,  
Gwalior (M.P.).

[No. 118/HQ/67/Enf/4966.]

*New Delhi, the 4th December 1967*

**S.O. 403.**—A licence No. P/RM/2154968/C/XX/23/C/H/23-24/RMI, dated 14th November 1966 of the value of Rs. 1,20,000 for import of Raw Materials as per list attached to the licence was issued to M/s. S. K. Metal & Allied Works, Nainital Road, Izat Nagar, New Katha Factory, Bareilly (U.P.).

2. Thereafter, a show cause notice No. CCI/I(C)/16/67/3349, dated 16th November 1967 was issued asking them to show cause within ten days as to why the said licence in their favour should not be cancelled on the ground that the same was obtained on the basis of forged recommendation of the Directorate General of Technical Development in terms of Clause 9.

3. The aforesaid show cause notice, was received back undelivered from the Postal authorities with the remarks 'Not Known'.

4. The undersigned has carefully examined the case and has come to the conclusion that the said licence has been obtained on the basis of false and fabricated documents and the licence holders are avoiding the service of the show-cause notice.

5. Having regard to what has been stated in the preceding paragraph, the undersigned is satisfied that the licence in question should be cancelled or otherwise rendered ineffective. Therefore, the undersigned, in exercise of the powers vested in him under Clause 9(c) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1958 hereby cancel the licence No. P/RM/2154968/C/XX/23/C/H/23-24/RMI, dated 14th November 1966 for Rs. 1,20,000 issued in favour of M/s. S. K. Metal and Allied Works, Nainital Road, Izat Nagar, New Katha Factory, Bareilly (U.P.).

To,

M/s. S. K. Metal & Allied Works,  
Nainital Road, Izat Nagar,  
New Katha Factory,  
Bareilly (U.P.).

[No. CCI/I(C)/16/67/3688.]

**B. D. BHATTACHARYA,**  
Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

**(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)****ORDER**

*New Delhi, the 15th January 1968*

**S.O. 404.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Import Control Order, 1955, dated 7th December 1955 as amended, the undersigned hereby cancels the Customs Purposes copy of import Licence No. G/HP/2075189/C/PD/19/C/H/18/CG.II, dated 3rd April 1964 for Rs. 1,16,594 after devaluation Rs. 1,83,635:55 (Rupees one lakh eighty-three thousand six hundred and thirty-five and paise fifty five only) issued to the Chief Engineer (Hydro Electric) of Assam State Electricity Board, Shillong. The original Customs Purpose copy of the licence was utilised for Rs. 1,76,323:54 (Rupees one lakh seventy-six thousand three hundred and twenty-three and paise fifty four only).

2. The reason for the cancellation is that the Customs Purposes copy of the licence has been lost/misplaced by the licensee who had requested for the issue of a duplicate licence in lieu thereof.

To,  
The Chief Electrical Engineer,  
Assam State Electricity Board,  
Shillong-1.

[No. CGII/A.38/63.64/1844.]

G. S. SHARMA,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports  
for Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

**(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)****ORDER**

*New Delhi, the 20th January 1968*

**S.O. 405.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause 9 of the Imports Control Order 1955 dated the 7th December, 1955, as amended from time to time the undersigned hereby cancels the Import Licence No. G/RC/2083689/R/IB/20/C/H/19-20 dated the 2nd January, 1965 (both the Exchange Control and Customs Purposes fully unutilised) for the import of Master Control Switch valued at Rs. 2150 issued in favour of M/s. J. Stone and Co. (I) Pvt. Ltd., 16, Taratolla Road, Alipore, Calcutta.

The reason for cancellation is that the Controller of Stores, S. Rly, Madras has cancelled the Rly Order.

[No. 131-J/Rly/64-65/L-VI/917.]

S. A. SESHAN,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

**(Office of the Chief Controller of Imports and Exports)****ORDER**

*New Delhi, the 3rd February 1968*

**S.O. 406.**—M/s Gazebo Restaurant, Bombay were granted an Import Licence No. P/AU/1287179/C/XX/25/C/II/23-24 dated 27th April, 1967 for Rs. 1,000 (Rupees one thousand only). They have applied for the issue of a duplicate Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copies of the said licence on the ground that the original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control copies have been lost/misplaced. It is further stated that the original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control copies were not registered with the Customs authorities at any port or Bank and not utilised at all.

2. In support of this contention, the applicant has filed an affidavit. I am accordingly satisfied that the original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copies of the said licence have been lost. Therefore, in exercise of the

powers conferred under Sub-clause 9(cc) of the Imports (Control) Order, 1955 dated 7th December, 1955 as amended, the said original Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copies of Licence No. P/AU/1267179/C/XX/25/C/H/23-24 dated 27th April, 1967 issued to M/s. Gazebo Restaurant, Bombay are hereby cancelled.

3. A duplicate Customs Purposes and Exchange Control Purposes copies of the said licence are being issued separately to the licensee.

[No. 14/211/1/AM-68/ILS.]

x

S. K. USMANI,

Dy. Chief Controller of Imports and Exports.

### MINISTRY OF PETROLEUM & CHEMICALS

*New Delhi, the 20th January 1968*

**S.O. 407.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that it is necessary in the public interest that for the transport of Petroleum from Lakwa Group Gathering Station No. 1 in Assam State to Moran Oil field in the State of Assam a pipeline should be laid by the Oil and Natural Gas Commission and that for the purpose of laying such a pipeline, it is necessary to acquire the right of user in the land described in the Schedule annexed hereto:

2. Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by Sub-section (i) of section 3 of the Petroleum Pipelines (Acquisition of Right of User in Land) Act, 1962 (50 of 1962) the Central Government hereby declares its intention to acquire the right of user therein.

3. Any person interested in the said land may, within 21 days from the date of this Notification, object to the laying of the pipelines under the land to the competent authority. Every person making such objection shall also state specifically whether he wishes to be heard in person or by a legal practitioner.

#### SCHEDULE

District	Sub-Division	Mouza	Village/Areas
Sibsagar	Sibsagar	Abhoypur	Grant No. 2883/13

[No. 20(5)/67-Prod/IOC.]

P. P. GUPTA, Under Secy.

### MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES & METALS

(Department of Mines and Metals)

*New Delhi, the 19th January 1968*

**S.O. 408.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 7 of the Coal Bearing Areas (Acquisition and Development) Act, 1957 (20 of 1957), and of all other powers enabling it in this behalf, the Central Government hereby rescinds the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Mines and Metals No. S.O. 861, dated the 21st March, 1966.

[No. C2-22(2)/65.]

M S. K. RAMASWAMY, Dy. Secy.

### MINISTRY OF HEALTH, FAMILY PLANNING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT

(Department of Health)

*New Delhi, the 23rd January 1968*

**S.O. 409.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (p) of sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Indian Ports Act, 1908 (15 of 1908), the Central Government hereby makes the following rules further to amend the Indian Port Health

Rules, 1955, the same having been previously published as required by sub-section (2) of section 6 of the said Act, namely:—

1. These rules may be called the Indian Port Health (Amendment) Rules, 1968.
2. In the Indian Port Health Rules, 1955—
  - (i) in sub-rule (2) of rule 57, in item (H) of the Note, for the words "Visakhapatnam and Mandapam Camp/Dhanushkodi", the words "Visakhapatnam, Mandapam Camp/Dhanushkodi and Mandapam Camp/Rameswarai" shall be substituted;
  - (ii) in rule 67, for the words "the District Magistrate for the place of death", the words "the District Magistrate or the Deputy Commissioner or the Chief Presidency Magistrate or the Coroner within whose jurisdiction the death took place" shall be substituted.

[No. F. 33-1/64-IH.]

AMAR NATH VARMA, Under Secy.

### (Department of Health)

New Delhi, the 23rd January 1968

*In the matter of Charitable Endowments Act—1890 and in the matter of "The Lady Hardinge Hospital for Women and Children, Delhi, Fund."*

**S.O. 410.**—On the application of and with the concurrence of the Board of Administration for "Lady Hardinge Hospital for Women and Children, Delhi, Fund" and in exercise of the powers conferred on it by section 4 of the Charitable Endowments Act, 1890 (6 of 1890), the Central Government do hereby order and direct that the sum of Rs. 6 00,000 (Rupees Six Lakhs) only relating to the Employees' Provident Fund Account and invested in 12 year National Defence Certificates, shall vest in the Treasurer of Charitable Endowments for India.

[No. F. 4-22/66-ME(UG).]

V. K. SAMONTROY, Under Secy.

### (Department of Health)

#### ORDER

New Delhi, the 17th January 1968

**S.O. 411.**—Whereas the Government of India in the late Ministry of Health has, by notification No. 16-8/60-MI, dated the 1st February 1961, made, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956) recognised the medical qualification M.D. (Ohio State University, U.S.A.), for the purposes of the said Act;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to sub-section (1) of section 14 of the Indian Medical Council Act, 1956 (102 of 1956), the Central Government hereby specifies the period of two years with effect from the date of issue of this order or so long as Dr. Robert Leroy Barth who possesses the said qualification, continues, to work in the Wanless Hospital Miraj Medical Centre, P.O. Miraj M.H. Sangli District, Maharashtra to which he is attached for the time being for the purposes of teaching, research or charitable work, whichever is shorter, as the period to which the medical practice of the said Dr. Robert Leroy Barth shall be limited:

Provided that the said doctor continues to be enrolled as a medical practitioner for the said period in accordance with the law regulating the registration of medical practitioners in his country.

[No. F. 19-60/67-MPT.]

L. K. MURTHY, Under Secy.

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS****(P. & T. Board)***New Delhi, the 27th January 1968*

**S.O. 412.**—In pursuance of para (a) of Section III of Rule 434 of Indian Telegraph Rules, 1951, as introduced by S.O. No. 627 dated 8th March, 1960, the Director-General, Posts and Telegraphs, hereby specifies the 16th February 1968 as the date on which the Measured Rate System will be introduced in Jagdalpur Telephone Exchange.

[No. 5-34/68-PHB.]

D. R. BAHL,

Asstt. Director Genl. (PHB).

**संचार विभाग****(डाक-तार बोर्ड)***नई दिल्ली, 27 जनवरी, 1968*

**एस० ओ० 413.**—स्पर्ध आदेश क्रमसंख्या 627, दिनांक 8 मार्च 1960 द्वारा लागू किए गए 1951 के भारतीय तार निवर्तों के नियम 434 के खण्ड III के पैरा (क) के अनुसार डाक-तार सहायनियंत्रक ने जगदलपुर टेलीफोन केन्द्र में 16-2-68 से प्रस्तापित दर प्रणाली लागू करने का निर्णय किया है।

[सं० 5-34668-पी० एच० बी]

डी० आर० बहल,

सहायक महा निदेशक।

पी० एच० बी०

**CENTRAL ELECTRICITY AUTHORITY***New Delhi, the 18th January 1968*

**S.O. 414.**—On his reversion to the C.W.&P.C. (Power Wing) Shri Gyan Prakash relinquished charge of the post of Secretary, North Eastern Regional Electricity Board on the forenoon of the 18th October, 1967.

2. In exercise of the power conferred by Sub-Section (6) of Section 3 of the Electricity (Supply) Act, 1948 (LIV of 1948), the Central Electricity Authority appointed Shri L. P. Jain, Assistant Director in the Central Water and Power Commission (Power Wing) as Secretary, North Eastern Regional Electricity Board, Shillong with effect from the forenoon of the 18th October, 1967 until further orders.

3. This notification is in supersession of this office notification of even number, dated the 25th October, 1967.

[No. 21/4/67-Adm.I.]

M. M. DHAWAN, Under Secy.  
for Chairman, C.E.A**DELHI DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY***New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968*

**S.O. 415.**—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-section (4) of Section 22 of the Delhi Development Act, 1957, the Delhi Development Authority has replaced at the disposal of the Central Government the land described in the schedule below for placing it at the disposal of the Land and Development Officer, Ministry

of Works, Housing and Supply, Government of India, New Delhi for further transfer to Delhi Administration for construction of embankment on the right bank of river Jamuna from Nigham Bodh Ghat to Kudsia Ghat Nala for affording flood protection to the Jamuna Bazar Area. Possession of the land under reference has already been handed over to the Ministry of Works, Housing and Supply, Govt. of India on 6th January 1966.

#### SCHEDULE

Piece of land measuring 3.69 acres bearing Kh. No. 235/106-36 situated in Bela Estate.

The above piece of land is bounded as follows:—

North: Civil Line Area.

South: Nigam Bodh Ghat.

East: River Jamuna.

West: Nazul Land.

[No. L2(15)64.]

M. L. MONGIA, Secy.

### MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND SHIPPING

#### (Transport Wing)

#### MERCHANT SHIPPING

*New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968*

**S.O. 416.**—In pursuance of clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 283 of the Merchant Shipping Act, 1958 (44 of 1958), the Central Government hereby declares that the Government of the Islamic Republic of Mauritania have accepted the Safety Convention as defined in clause (37) of section 3 of the said Act, that is to say, the Convention for the Safety of Life at Sea signed in London on the Seventeenth day of June, nineteen hundred and sixty, as amended from time to time.

[No. F. 46-MA(10)/67.]

B. B. LAL, Under Secy.

#### ERRATA

In the Ministry of Transport and Shipping (Transport Wing) Notification No. 32-MD(22)/67, dated the 31st October, 1967, published as S.O. 3996 on page 4169 in the Gazette of India—Part II, section 3; sub-section (ii), dated the 11th November, 1967, the following corrections are to be made:—

In the 6th line of the notification for the words "October, 1947" read "October, 1967".

### MINISTRY OF LABOUR, EMPLOYMENT & REHABILITATION

#### (Department of Labour & Employment)

*New Delhi, the 19th January 1968*

**S.O. 417.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance (Amendment) Act, 1966 (44 of 1966), the Central Government hereby appoints the twenty-eighth day of January, 1968, as the date on which the provisions of sub-section (3) of section 1, section 2 [except sub-section (4) which has already been brought into force], sections 3, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20 to 27 (both inclusive), sections 30, 32 to 34 (both inclusive), sections 38 to 40 (both inclusive), sections 42 and 43 of the said Act shall come into force in the whole of India except the State of Jammu and Kashmir.

[No. F. 1/15/66-HI.]

**S.O. 418.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5D of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation No. S.O. 2549, dated the 24th July, 1967, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri A. S. Sattanathan as Regional Provident Fund Commissioner with effect from the 30th November, 1967 for the whole of the State of Kerala and Mahe area of the Union territory of Pondicherry, to assist the Central Provident Fund Commissioner in the discharge of his duties vice Shri K. S. Sethi granted leave.

[No. 17(89)/66-PF.I.]

**S.O. 419.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Shankarlal Rath and Brothers, Saroj Talkies Building, Amravati (Maharashtra State) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 1st day of January, 1968.

[No. 8(220)/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 420.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Shree Kalanidhi Press, No. 845, Chickpet, Bangalore-2, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of December, 1967.

[No. 8/218/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 421.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Joy Ice Creams (Bangalore) Private Limited, Main Road, Whitefield, Bangalore have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of December, 1967.

[No. 8/213/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 422.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs D. V. P. Bakery, 81, Long Bazar, Vellore, North Arcot District (Madras) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 31st day of January, 1968.

[No. 8/217/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 423.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Jayantilal Chimmlal, Chapsey Building, Princess Street, Bombay-2, (Maharashtra State) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;



Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of March, 1967

[No. 8(199)/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 424.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Rotogravurs, 133, Dr. Annie Besant Road, Worli, Bombay-13, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of October, 1967.

[No. 8/210/67/PF.II.]

**S.O. 425.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Aravenu Plantations Tea Factory, Aravenu Post Office, The Nilgiris (Madras State) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of December, 1967.

[No. 8/212/67/PF-II.]

**S.O. 426.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Udipi New Krishna Bhavan, Kothapeta, Guntur (Andhra Pradesh), have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 30th day of November, 1967.

[No. 8/220/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 427.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Western Garments Manufacturing Company, Hind Rajasthan Industrial Estate, Unit Nos. 308/312, 3rd floor, Naigaum Cross Road, Wadala, Bombay-31, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st August, 1967.

[No. 8/149/67-PF II.]

**S.O. 428.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Kanarich and Company, 70, Thayar Sahib Street, Madras-2, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall come into force on the 31st day of January, 1968.

[No. 8/214/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 429.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Vijay Electroplating Works, Dhobiwadi, Thakurwar, Bombay-2, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of November, 1966.

[No. 8/55/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 430.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Sahadevan Offset Printers, Sivakasi (Madras State) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

[No. 8(224)/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 431.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs Ashish Engineering Works, S/47, Municipal Industrial Estate, Behind Vikram Mills, Ahmedabad have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 30th day of November, 1967.

[No. 8/216/67-PF.II.]

*New Delhi, the 20th January 1968*

**S.O. 432.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 5A of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints the Secretary to the Government of Orissa, Labour, Employment and Housing Department, and the Secretary to the Government of Punjab, Labour and Employment Department, as members of the Central Board of Trustees and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Department of Social Security No. S.O. 1156, dated the 1st April, 1965, namely:—

In the said notification, for items 7 and 11 and the existing entries thereunder, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

"7. The Secretary to the Government of Punjab, Labour and Employment Department, Chandigarh."

"11. The Secretary to the Government of Orissa, Labour, Employment and Housing Department, Bhubaneshwar."

[No. 12/5/63/PF-II.]

**S.O. 433.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 22 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, Rajasthan, as the Secretary of the Regional Committee for the State of Rajasthan set up under

the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 3140, dated the 29th August, 1967, published in Part II, section 3(ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 9th September, 1967.

[No. PF.II.10(3)/59.]

*New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968*

**S.O. 434.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as the proprietors Regal Buildings, 10-Regal Buildings, New Delhi-1, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of March, 1967.

[No. 8/185/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 435.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as Messrs. Bulchand and Company, Abid Road, Hyderabad (Andhra Pradesh) have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment;

Now therefore in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 1st day of January, 1967

[No. 8(3)66-PF.II.]

**S.O. 436.**—Whereas it appears to the Central Government that the employer and the majority of the employees in relation to the establishment known as the Chitra Katha Cinema, Agartala, Tripura, have agreed that the provisions of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), should be made applicable to the said establishment.

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (4) of section 1 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby applies the provisions of the said Act to the said establishment.

This notification shall be deemed to have come into force on the 31st day of August, 1967.

[No. 8/140/67-PF.II.]

**S.O. 437.**—In pursuance of clause (d) of sub-paragraph (1) of paragraph 4 of the Employees' Provident Funds Scheme, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri T. M. Prabha, as a member of the Regional Committee for the State of Kerala and makes the following amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No S.O. 1245, dated the 14th April, 1966, namely:—

In the said notification, against serial No. 9, for the entry "Shri T. K. Divakaran, Municipal Chairman, Quilon", the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"Shri T. M. Prabha, All Kerala Cashewnut Factory Workers' Federation, Quilon".

[No. 12(1)66-PF.II.]

*New Delhi, the 23rd January 1968*

**S.O. 438.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby appoints the 28th day of January, 1968 as the date on which the

provisions of Chapter IV (except sections 44 and 45 which have already been brought into force) and Chapters V and VI [except sub-section (1) of section 76 and sections 77, 78, 79 and 81 which have already been brought into force] of the said Act shall come into force in the following areas in the State of Mysore, namely:—

1. Area situated within the Municipal limits of Nanjangud town.
2. Area situated outside the town Municipal limits in Survey No 145/1, 145/2, and 146 of Chikkayyana Chatra village, Chatra Hobli, Nanjangud.
3. Area situated outside the town Municipal limits in Survey Nos. 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 145, 146, 147, 158 to 166, 170 and 321/3 of Chamalapura village Kasaba Hobli, Nanjangud Taluk.

[No. F. 13(2)/68-HL.]

*New Delhi, the 27th January 1968*

**S.O. 439.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (b) of sub-section (1) of section 5A of the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Dr. S. T. Merani, Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), as a member of the Central Board of Trustees vice Shri N. N. Chatterjee, and makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the late Department of Social Security No. S.O. 1156 dated the 1st April, 1965, namely:—

In the said notification, in item 2, for the existing entry, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

“Dr. S. T. Merani, Joint Secretary to the Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment), New Delhi.”

[No. 12/5/63-PF-II.]

DALJIT SINGH. Under Secy.

#### **(Department of Labour & Employment,**

*New Delhi, the 19th January 1968*

**S.O. 440.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following Award of Shri I. B. Sanyal, Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) New Delhi, Arbitrator in the dispute between the Banki Colliery of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Banki Mogra, District Bilaspur and their workmen represented by the Khadan Mazdoor Union, Post Office Banki Mogra, District Bilaspur, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th January, 1968.

In the matter of arbitration in the industrial dispute in the Banki Colliery of National Coal Development Corporation Limited over the retrenchment of Shri A. V. Ramana, Dozer Fitter.

#### **AWARD**

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) by their Order No. 5/24/67-LRII, dated the 8th August, 1967, published the written agreement dated 12th July, 1967 of the employers and workmen of the Banki Colliery, P.O. Bankimogra (M.P.) under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act referring the above dispute to my arbitration. The specific matters in dispute were “Whether the retrenchment of Shri A. V. Ramana, Dozer Fitter, with effect from 7th June, 1967 was legal and proper? If not, to what relief is he entitled?”

The written statements of the parties and their comments on each other's statement having been obtained I heard them on 21st November, 1967. The employers were represented by Shri S. P. Mathur, Deputy Superintendent of Collieries, Banki Colliery, and the workmen by Shri P. K. Thakur, General Secretary Khadan Mazdoor Union. Certain documents were later on furnished by the management as promised by them during the hearing.

The case of the union was:

- (1) that Shri Ramana was working in both the Banki and Surakachar Collieries as a Mechanical Fitter and not as a Dozer Fitter;
- (2) that he was wrongly assessed as surplus;
- (3) that no notice of retrenchment was issued to him, and
- (4) that Section 25F(b) was violated.

I have carefully gone into the written statements, documents and arguments of the parties before me. The appointment letter of Shri Ramana shows that he was specifically appointed as Dozer Fitter. Certain applications (Ex. 'A', 'B' and 'C') made by Shri Ramana to the management also show that he treated himself as Dozer Fitter. Even if the contention of the Union is accepted that he had worked sometimes on heavy vehicles like Cranes, Roadrollers etc., that does not entitle him to be treated as a general mechanical fitter in the absence of any past experience of maintenance of general mine machinery as contended by the management. The union's further contention that since there was a vacancy in the post of Dozer Operator-cum-Mechanic in the Surakachar Colliery, Shri Ramana should have been given that post, cannot be accepted simply for the reason that he was not an employee of Surakachar Colliery. His appointment letter was no doubt issued by the Deputy Superintendent of Collieries, Banki and Surakachar but this cannot be an argument that he was an employee of both the Collieries. As explained by the management, the two collieries were separate establishments with separate Managers and Executive Engineers but with one Deputy Superintendent of Collieries till 30th October, 1963 when two Deputy Superintendents were posted—one for each Colliery. It also appears from record that Shri Ramana was drawing his salary etc., from the Banki Colliery only and all applications for his leave were addressed to the Executive Engineer, Banki. The mere fact that he was asked to work often in Surakachar Colliery on specific requests from that Colliery cannot be taken to mean that he had acquired a right to be treated as an employee of that Colliery.

I do not find that the retrenchment of Shri Ramana was actuated by a *malafide* motive. He was retrenched as the operation of the Dozer was not needed but since the conveyor could not be put into commission, he was re-employed as a Dozer Mechanic for a specific period upto 30th September, 1967.

The union has stated that the retrenchment notice was not served on Shri Ramana. If it were so, how could they by their letter dated 8th May, 1967 question the legality and justifiability of his retrenchment before the Asstt. Labour Commissioner (Central), Bilaspur? I am, therefore, not inclined to think that Shri Ramana could remain ignorant of such a notice.

The union has argued that the retrenchment was not effected by the employer (i.e. N.C.D.C. Ltd.) but illegally by the Deputy Superintendent of Collieries. I cannot accept this arguments as correct. It is not statutorily obligatory on the part of an employer himself to sign the retrenchment notice. It would be quite in order for his Agent to do this as has been done by the Deputy Superintendent of Collieries in the present case.

Regarding the contention of the Union that Section 25F(b) was violated, I find that during the pendency of retrenchment notice the union had raised an industrial dispute before the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Bilaspur, and that as a result of this the present reference of the dispute to my arbitration had arisen. It would not, therefore, be correct to say that the above Section was violated. I also observe that there was no wrong assessment of his surplusage on the part of the management as in the category of Dozer Fitter in the Banki Colliery, there was no other person.

In the result, I decide the matters in dispute as under:—

The retrenchment of Shri A. V. Ramana, Dozer Fitter, with effect from 7th June, 1967 was legal and proper. The question of his entitlement to any relief therefore does not arise.

(Sd.) I. B. SANYAL,  
Arbitrator & Dy. Chief Labour  
Commissioner (Central).

11-1-68.

Dated, New Delhi, 11th Jan. 1968.

[No. 5/24/67-LRII.]

**S.O. 441.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following Award of **Shri I. B. Sanyal**, Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi, Arbitrator in the dispute between the Banki Colliery of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Banki Mogra, District Bilaspur and their workmen represented by the Khadan Mazdoor Union, Post Office Banki Mogra, District Bilaspur, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th January, 1968.

In the matter of arbitration in the industrial dispute in the Banki Colliery of National Coal Development Corporation Limited over the retrenchment of **Shri Kalika Sharma**.

### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment & Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) by their Order No. 5/23/67-LR11, dated 8th August 1967, published the written agreement dated 12th July, 1967 of the employers and workmen of the Banki Colliery, P.O. Bankimogra (M.P.) under Section 10-A(i) of the Industrial Disputes Act referring the above dispute to my arbitration. The specific matters in dispute were "Whether the retrenchment of **Shri Kalika Sharma** w.e.f. 7th June, 1967 was legal and proper? If not, to what relief is he entitled?"

After obtaining the written statements of the parties and their comments on each other's statement, I heard them on 21st November, 1967. The employers were represented by **Shri S. P. Mathur**, Deputy Superintendent of Collieries, Banki Colliery and the workmen by **Shri P. K. Thakur**, General Secretary, Khadan Mazdoor Union. Later on certain documents were received from the parties. I have carefully considered these statements and documents as also the arguments of the parties. The main contentions of the Union against the legality and propriety of retrenchment of **Shri Kalika Sharma** were:

- (1) that he was a mechanical fitter and not a compressor fitter;
- (2) that the retrenchment notice was not signed by the employer but by someone for Deputy Superintendent of Collieries; and
- (3) that Section 25F (b) of the Industrial Disputes Act was violated in that the workman was not paid compensation at the time of retrenchment.

The appointment letter of **Shri Sharma** (Ex. 'A') shows that he was specifically appointed as a Compressor Fitter and not a Mechanical Fitter. Certain letters (Ex. 'A1', 'E' and 'F') written by him to the management also show that **Shri Sharma** was a Compressor Fitter. In one of them he had stated that he was a "qualified Compressor Fitter" having "practical experience of about 5 years at various places not only as Compressor Fitter but of a highly skilled job of Compressor i.e. Senior Compressor Mechanic". The union has sent me the original certificate given by the Assistant Engineer (E&M) to **Shri Sharma** on 28th November 1967 with the comments that he was not exclusively engaged on Compressor. This Certificate was obtained about six months after his retrenchment and it was given as **Shri Sharma** wanted to apply for some post elsewhere. I cannot accept this Certificate as an evidence to show that **Shri Sharma** was not working mainly as a Compressor Fitter.

The retrenchment notice was signed for the Deputy Superintendent of Collieries, I find no illegality in this. The union's contention that since the retrenchment notice was not signed by the employer himself, the retrenchment was illegal, cannot hold good since there is no statutory provision to show that such a notice has to be signed by the employer himself and not by his Agent.

Since the Compressors were withdrawn from the mine, **Shri Sharma**, Compressor Fitter, naturally became surplus to requirements. I do not find any reasons to suspect that the intention behind the retrenchment was *malafide* or was actuated by ulterior considerations.

Regarding the contention that Section 25F (b) was violated, I find that the question of payment of retrenchment compensation could not arise as during the pendency of the notice of retrenchment the union raised an industrial dispute by challenging the legality of the retrenchment notice and requested the Assistant Labour Commissioner (C) Bilaspur to take up the case in conciliation. This was done by the latter and the present reference to arbitration arose in consequence of his intervention. Therefore, there cannot be any question of violation of Section 25F(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act.

In the result I decide the specific matters in dispute as under:—

The retrenchment of Shri Kallka Sharma with effect from 7th June 1967 was legal and proper. The question of his entitlement to any relief, therefore, does not arise.

Sd/- I. B. SANYAL,

Arbitrator & Dy. Chief Labour Commissioner (C)  
11-1-68.

Dated, New Delhi, 11th January, 1968

[No. 5/23/67-LRIL.]

New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968

**S.O. 442.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following Award of Shri I. B. Sanyal, Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central), New Delhi, Arbitrator in the dispute between the Korba Colliery of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Korba Colliery, District Bilaspur and their workmen represented by the Khadan Mazdur Union, Post Office Korba Colliery, District Bilaspur, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th January, 1968.

### AWARD

In the matter of arbitration in the industrial dispute in the Korba Colliery between the employer (National Coal Development Corporation Limited) and their workmen.

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour & Employment) by their Order No. 5/22/67-LRIL, dated 8th August 1967, published the written agreement dated 14th July 1967 of the employers and workmen of the Korba Colliery P.O. Korba Colliery (M.P.) under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act referring the above dispute to my arbitration. The specific matters in dispute were "Whether Shri R. K. Kar, Shovel Operator Grade II of Korba Colliery of M/s. N.C.D.C. Ltd., is entitled to be promoted to the post of Shovel Operator Grade I? If so, from what date and what relief should he get?"

Having obtained the written statements of the parties and their comments on each other's statement, I heard them on 22nd November 1967 and 23rd November 1967. The employers were represented by Shri S. P. Mathur, Deputy Superintendent of Collieries, Banki Colliery and the workmen by Shri P. K. Thakur, General Secretary, Khadan Mazdoor Union.

I have carefully gone into the written statements, documents and arguments of the parties before me. The job description given in the Excavation Award is as follows:—

"A highly skilled workman with not less than 7 years experience in the operation and handling of Electric/Diesel Dragline/Shovel of a capacity not less than 4/4½ Cu. Yds. In addition he should have general knowledge of mechanism in use and should undertake minor running repairs."

It has been admitted by the management that no fully experienced Shovel Operator, as per the Excavation Award, was available at Korba and, therefore, in consultation with the recognised union of the Colliery they gave opportunity of training on Russain Shovels to the following workers and on completion of their training to the satisfaction of the Russain Experts, they were promoted as Shovel Operator Grade I:—

- (1) Shri Sajjan Singh—Crane Operator
- (2) Shri Rajendra Singh—Dumper Operator
- (3) Shri Jeeta Singh—Dumper Operator

It is not the contention of the Union that the management did a wrong thing in promoting workers of Korba Colliery. It is, however, their contention that Shri R. K. Kar should have been given training on Russain Shovels and promoted in view of his special experience. I find from the evidence on record that none of the persons, who were promoted as Shovel Operator Grade I possessed any experience in the operation and handling of Electrical/Diesel Dragline Shovel of a

capacity not less than 4 to 4½ Cu Yds. The Ex. 'D', 'E' and 'F', which were filed by the management were actually, as rightly pointed out by the union, not certificates from the competent authorities, under whom they were alleged to have worked before, but from the workers themselves. No evidence has been led by the management to show that such statements of the workers had been verified before they were accepted as correct. Those certificates also do not show that they had worked on Shovels of a capacity not less than 4 to 4½ Cu Yds. It is, however, on record that Shri R. K. Kar had worked continuously for less than 2 years on a Shovel of a capacity not less than 4 1½ Cu. Yds. It is not understood why he had not been selected for training on Russain Shovel before promotion to the next higher grade, and instead workers who had not worked on any Shovel, not to say of the required capacity, were taken up for training and subsequent promotion. It is, therefore obvious that a great injustice had been done to Shri Kar in the matter.

In the result, I decide the specific matters in dispute as under:—

Shri R. K. Kar, Shovel Operator Grade II of Korba Colliery of N.C.D.C. Ltd., is entitled to be promoted to the post of Shovel Operator Grade I w.e.f. 21st March 1960 and paid arrears of wages from that date. I also direct that such arrears of wages shall be paid within 30 days of publication of this Award.

Sd/- I. B. SANYAL.

Arbitrator & Dy Chief Labour Commissioner (C),

12-1-68.

Dated New Delhi, the 12th January, 1968

[No. 5/22/67-LR.II.]

**S.O. 443.**— In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following Award of Shri I. B. Sanyal, Deputy Chief Labour Commissioner (Central) New Delhi, Arbitrator in the dispute between the Banki Colliery of Messrs National Coal Development Corporation Limited, Post Office Banki Mogra, District Bilaspur and their workmen represented by the Khadan Mazdoor Union, Post Office Banki Mogra, District Bilaspur, which was received by the Central Government on the 17th January, 1968.

In the matter of arbitration in the industrial dispute in the Banki Colliery between the employers (National Coal Development Corporation Limited) and their workmen.

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) by their Order No. 5/25/67-LR.II, dated the 8th August, 1967, published the written agreement dated 12th July 1967, of the employers and workmen of the Banki Colliery, P.O. Bankimogra (M. P.) under section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act referring the above dispute to my arbitration. The specific matters in dispute were "Whether the management of Banki Colliery of M/s National Coal Development Corporation Limited is justified in retrenching the following workmen from the dates shown against each of them? If not, to what relief are these workmen entitled?"

S. No.	Name	Designation	Date of retrenchment
1	2	3	4
1.	Shri K. K. Sreedharan	Workmistiy	from 14-6 1967
2.	" S. C. Sarkar	"	from 14 6-1967
3	" R. N. Singh	"	from 31 7-1967
4	" B. P. Lal	Work Supervisor	from 31-7-1967

The written statements of the parties and their comments on each other's statement having been obtained I heard them on 21st and 22nd November, 1967. The employers were represented by Shri S. P. Mathur, Deputy Superintendent of Collieries, Banki Colliery and the workmen by Shri P. K. Thakur, General Secretary, Khadan Mazdoor Union. Some documents required to be furnished by the parties were received later on.



The main contentions of the union against the justifiability of retrenchment of S/Shri Sreedharan, Sarkar, Singh and Lal were:

- (1) that they were the work-charged staff under the control of Chief Engineer (Civil) and, therefore, they belonged to a separate establishment;
- (2) that the workmen to be retrenched should have been the junior most in the Civil Section of N.C.D.C. Ltd;
- (3) that those workmen had not been retrenched by the employer but by the Deputy Superintendent of Collieries who was not competent to do so under the Industrial Disputes Act;
- (4) that the provisions of Section 25F(b) were violated; and
- (5) that there was still work for these workers.

I have given careful consideration to the statements, documents and arguments advanced by the parties. It is on record that the N.C.D.C. Ltd., had considered the question of absorption of surplus work-charged staff in different collieries but could not retain them in employment in the absence of any alternative jobs being available. The Managing Director, therefore, ordered that such surplus staff be retrenched. The surplus staff in the Banki Colliery were accordingly retrenched.

I do not agree with the union that the Deputy Superintendent of Collieries was not competent to retrench the workmen in question. In his capacity as Agent of the employer he certainly had jurisdiction in the matter, the more so, as the Managing Director has given orders to retrench the surplus staff. The Deputy Superintendent of Collieries does not derive his powers from the Mines Act as erroneously conceived by the Union. I also do not agree with the Union that the work-charged staff were not workmen of the Banki Colliery. They fulfilled all the necessary conditions for being treated as workmen of the Banki Colliery a distinct industrial establishment.

The management have stated that although some civil works were going on at Banki Colliery, these were of a minor or routine nature. They have also stated that the works were being gradually reduced and this necessitated retrenchment in stages. No evidence has been led by the Union to show that the statement of the management was incorrect or that the retrenchment was malafide. As these workers were junior most of the work-charged staff in the Banki Colliery, they were retrenched. There was, therefore, no violation of Section 25G of the Industrial Disputes Act. There also does not appear to be any violation of Section 25F(b) of the Industrial Disputes Act. The union by their letter dated 14th April 1967 addressed to the Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Bilaspur, had raised an industrial dispute during the pendency of the retrenchment notice by challenging the legality of the retrenchment of these workmen and asked for his intervention. Due to his intervention the present reference to my arbitration had arisen. Therefore, the question of payment of retrenchment compensation could not arise. Incidentally I find that Shri K. K. Sreedharan. Workmistry had lifted his retrenchment compensation on 16th June 1967 and the others did not.

In the result, I decide the matters in dispute as under:—

The management of Banki Colliery of National Coal Development Corporation Ltd., was justified in retrenching S/Shri K. K. Sreedharan, S. C Sarkar, R. N. Singh, Work Mistries, and B. P. Lal, Work Supervisor. The question of their entitlement to any relief, therefore, does not arise.

Sd./- I. B. SANYAL,

Arbitrator and the Dy. Chief Labour Commissioner

Dated, New Delhi, the 12th January, 1968.

12.1.1968.

[No. 5/25/67-LRII.]

New Delhi, the 23rd January 1968

**S.O. 444.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal (No. 2), Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Jealgora Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited, (Jealgora, Post Office Jealgora District Dhanbad) and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 18th January, 1968.

## BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD

In the matter of a reference under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

REFERENCE No. 50 of 1967

### PARTIES:

Employers in relation to the Jealgora Colliery of M/s East Indian Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad.

AND

Their workmen.

### PRESENT:

Shri Nandagiri Venkata Rao.—*Presiding Officer.*

### APPEARANCES:

*For the employers.*—Sri D. Narsingh, Advocate.

*For the workmen.*—Sri Prasant Burman, Secretary, Khan Mazdoor Congress.

STATE: Bihar.

INDUSTRY: Coal.

Dhanbad, dated the 12th January 1968

### AWARD

The Central Government, being of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Jealgora Colliery of Messrs, East Indian Coal Company Limited, Post Office Jealgora, District Dhanbad and their workmen by its order No. 2/52/65/LRII dated 2nd June, 1965 referred to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad under Section 10(1)(d) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication the dispute in respect of the matters specified in the schedule annexed thereto. The schedule is extracted below:—

#### SCHEDULE

- “(1) Whether the management of Jealgora Colliery of M/s. East Indian Coal Company Limited (P.O. Jealgora, District Dhanbad) was justified in suspending with effect from the 2nd December 1964, Sarva-shri (1) Dhani, Pick Miner, E.B. No. 10925, (2) Deoki, Pick Miner, E.B. No. 10865, and (3) Marlidhar, Pick Miner, E.B. No. 10814?
- (2) If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?”

2. The Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad registered the reference as reference No. 96 of 1965 on its file. The workmen filed their statement of demands. While it was pending before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad the proceeding was transferred to this Tribunal, by the Central Government by its order No. 8/25/67-LRII dated 8th May, 1967 under Section 33(B)(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. Consequently, the reference is renumbered on the file of this Tribunal as reference No. 50 of 1967. The employers also filed their statement of demands.

3. Dhani, Deoki and Marlidhar (hereinafter referred to as the affected workmen) were Pick Miners in the colliery of the employers. They were served with chargesheets on 4th November, 1964 that they had forcibly occupied dhowrahs (quarters) and in spite of repeated instructions they were not vacating them. Domestic enquiries were held against them by the then Welfare Officer and he found them guilty of the charges. On 17th November, 1964 they were informed by individual letters of the finding of the enquiry officer and asking them to vacate the quarters within 10 days. They were also informed that in default they would be suspended pending discharge. On 22nd December, 1964 they were again served with letters stating that, as they had not vacated the quarters they were suspended forthwith. The case of the workmen is that the affected workmen occupied the quarters on oral consent of the manager or incharge, that their suspension was a result of the victimisation policy of employers owing to trade union activities of the affected workmen and others and that the suspensions were illegal and unjustified. The plea taken by the employers is that the suspensions were legal and justified and they were made after proper domestic enquiry. The employers also took preliminary objects to the sustainability of the reference stating that the transfer of the proceedings was ultra vires of Section 33B(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, that the dispute involved in the reference was not an

industrial dispute and that the affected workmen were not suspended from 2nd December, 1964, as stated in the order of reference and as such the Tribunal had no jurisdiction to correct the date as a typographical mistake. The workmen were represented by Sri Prasant Burman, Secretary Khan Mazdoor Congress and the employers by Sri D. Narsingh, Advocate. By consent of the workmen Exts. M1 to M9 were marked for the employers. On behalf of the workmen two witnesses, WW1 and WW2 were examined and Ext. M10 was marked. On behalf of the employers a witness, MW1 was examined and Exts. M11 to M13 were marked.

4. Sri Prasant Burman, representing the workmen made a statement that the affected workman Dhani was not any more interested in the reference and the other affected workman, Deoki had since died. He did not lead any evidence in respect of the two affected workmen. Thus, the only case remaining for enquiry was that of the affected workman, Marlidhar and it was whether his suspension was justified or not.

5. Regarding the preliminary objection that the transfer of the proceeding was *ultra vires* of Section 33B(1) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947, an order was passed on 17th August, 1967, over-ruling it. It is the admitted case of the parties that the affected workman was suspended with effect from 22nd December, 1964, and not from 2nd December, 1964, as mentioned in the order of reference. I consider that 2nd December, 1964, was a mere typographical mistake for 22nd December, 1964, and, as both the parties agreed that the suspension was from 22nd December, 1964 and not from 2nd December, 1964, I consider I have jurisdiction to treat 22nd December, 1964, as the correct date of suspension and 2nd December, 1964, as a typographical mistake. I hold accordingly.

6. The workmen had pleaded that the suspension of the affected workman was a result of the victimisation policy of the employers for his trade union activities. But there is absolutely no evidence in this respect. The Secretary of the Khan Mazdoor Congress, Prasant Burman, examined himself as WW1 and the affected workman as WW2. WW1 not even whispered about the victimisation policy of the employers. Similarly, there is nothing in the evidence of WW2 to indicate it. WW2 has deposed that along with him ten other workmen also had occupied quarters unauthorisedly and they vacated them subsequently. Thus, I do not find any substance in the allegation of the workmen.

7. The employers had pleaded that the dispute involved in the reference was not an industrial dispute. WW1, the Secretary of Khan Mazdoor Congress has stated that the affected workmen and the others of the colliery were members of Khan Mazdoor Congress since December, 1964 and that he had records to prove the facts. The affected workman, WW2 has also in his evidence that he had become a member of Khan Mazdoor Congress before he was suspended from service. The employers did not ask for records from WW1, nor did they bring any material on record to rebut the evidence of WW1 and WW2. The solitary witness, MW1 examined on behalf of the employers expressed his ignorance if the affected workman was or was not a member of Khan Mazdoor Congress. On this material I hold that there is no force in the objection of the employers that the dispute involved in the reference was not an industrial dispute.

8. The affected workman, WW2 himself has conceded that he occupied a quarter unauthorisedly and that he did not vacate it in spite of repeated directions from the employers. He also admitted that he had received the chargesheet and had submitted his explanation to it and that MW1 conducted the domestic enquiry in his presence and recorded statements of himself and a witness, Pandey. The chargesheet is Ext. M8, explanation Ext. M10 and statement of Pandey Ext. M12. This is not in dispute that the enquiry officer found the affected workman guilty of wilful insubordination or disobedience of the lawful order of his employers. This is a misconduct in terms of Standing Order 27 of the colliery. Suspension is one of the punishments for such misconduct. Consequently, there is no room to argue that the punishment of suspension of the affected workman was illegal or unwarranted. Sri Prasant Burman has vehemently argued that the suspension for indefinite period was illegal. But in terms of the reference I have only to find if the suspension of the affected workman was justified or not. It is to be observed that on his own showing the affected workman is working in Ena Colliery and yet has not vacated the quarter in the colliery of the employers.

9. I, therefore, hold that the management of Jealgora colliery of M/s. East Indian Coal Company Limited (P.O. Jealgora, Dist. Dhanbad) was justified in suspending with effect from the 22nd December, 1964, the affected workman (1) Dhani, Pick Miner, E.B. No. 10925, (2) Deoki Pick Miner, E.B. No. 10865, and (3) Marlidhar, Pick Miner, E.B. No. 10814, and, consequently, they are not entitled to any

relief. The award is made accordingly and submitted under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

Sd./- N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer,  
Central Government,  
Industrial Tribunal (No. 2),  
Dhanbad.

## APPENDIX I

## BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2) AT DHANBAD.

REFERENCE No. 50 OF 1967

Employers in relation to the Jealgora Colliery of M/s. East Indian Coal Company Limited,  
P.O. Jealgora, District Dhanbad.

AND  
Their Workmen

*List of Documents Admitted in Evidence for the Employers*

Distinguishing mark or number	Description of document & date	Date of admission	Whether admitted after or without objection
Ext. M1	Termination letter No. 122832 dated 22-12-64 to Sri Dhani	20-9-67	Admitted.
Ext. M2	Chargesheet No. JO/950/64 dated 1-10-64	Do.	Do.
Ext. M3	Enquiry notice dated 2-11-64	Do.	Do.
Ext. M4	Termination letter No. 122785 dated 22-12-64 to Sri Deoki	Do.	Do.
Ext. M5	Chargesheet No. JO/1000/64 dated 4-11-64 to Sri Deoki	Do.	Do.
Ext. M6	Termination letter No. 122827 dated 22-12-64 to Sri Marlidhar	Do.	Do.
Ext. M7	Letter No. MJ/155/64 dated 10-11-64 allowing time upto 20-11-64 to Marlidhar	Do.	Do.
Ext. M8	Chargesheet No. JO/1002/64 dated 4-11-64 to Shri Marlidhar	Do.	Do.
Ext. M9	Enquiry notice dated 4-11-64	Do.	Do.
Ext. M10	Statement of Sri Marlidhar dated 7-11-64	4-12-67	Proved by WW2
Ext. M11	Letter of the Colliery Manager dated 20-11-64 to Sri Marlidhar allowing time upto 30-11-64	Do.	Do. MWI
Ext. M12	Statement of Sri P. N. Pandey dated 17-11-64	Do.	Do. Do.
Ext. M13	Letter of the Welfare Officer dated 10-11-64 to the Colliery Manager	Do.	Do. Do.

*List of Documents Admitted in Evidence for the Workmen*

Distinguishing mark or number	Description of document & date	Date of admission	Whether admitted after or without objection
Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

Sd./- N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer,  
Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2),  
Dhanbad.

## APPENDIX II

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL (NO. 2)  
AT DHANBAD.

REFERENCE NO. 50 OF 1967

Employers in relation to the Jealgora Colliery of M/s. East Indian Coal Company Limited, P.O. Jealgora, District Dhanbad

AND

Their workmen

*List of Witness Examined for the Employers*

No. of witness	Name of witness	Date of examination
M.W.I.	Sri S. S. Rao . . . . .	4-12-67

*List of witnesses Examined for the Workmen*

No. of witness	Name of witness	Date of examination
WW I	Sri Prasant Burman . . . . .	4-12-67
WW 2	Sri Marlidhar . . . . .	4-12-67

Sd./- N. VENKATA RAO,  
Presiding Officer,  
Central Government Industrial Tribunal (No. 2)  
Dhanbad.

[No. 2/52/65-L RII.]

New Delhi, the 24th January 1968

S.O. 445.—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and their contractors, Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), Post Office Kusunda (Dhanbad), of the one part and their workmen of the other part, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th January, 1968

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR.

CAMP AT CALCUTTA.

Dated December 26, 1967

PRESENT:

Sri G. C. Agarwala.—Presiding Officer.

CASE REF. NO. 62 OF 1964 (DHANBAD TRIBUNAL)

CASE REFERENCE NO. CGIT/LC(R) (31)/67 (JABALPUR TRIBUNAL)

PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Kenduadih Colliery of M/s. East Indian Coal Company Ltd., and their Contractors, M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), P.O. Kusunda (Dhanbad) of the one part.

AND

Their workmen on the other part, represented through the Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad.

**APPEARANCES:**

*For employers.*—(1) Sri J. N. P. Sahi, Asstt. Chief Labour Officer for East Indian Co.

Indian Co., (2) Sri Mahabir Singh, for G. S. Atwal and Company.

*For workmen.*—Sri Lalit Verman, Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad (Bihar).

INDUSTRY: Coal Mine.

DISTRICT: Dhanbad (Bihar).

**AWARD**

By Notification No. 2/44/64-LR. II dated 25th May, 1964, the Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, referred the following dispute, as stated in the schedule to the order of reference, to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, from where it was transferred to this Tribunal by Notification No. 8/25/67-LR, II dated 25, 1967.

*Matter of Dispute*

Whether the action of the management of the Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company (1/12 Incline) and their Contractors Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company in transferring Shri Bajrangi Sah, Watchman, to Bararee Colliery and refusing to give him employment at Kenduadih Colliery (1/12 Incline) with effect from the 13th March, 1964, was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

The parties filed their statements of claim before the Dhanbad Tribunal. After the case was transferred to this Tribunal certain legal objections were raised which were determined by an order dated 21st July, 1967, and which is annexure "A" to this award.

When the case was taken up for hearing, the Raising Contractors M/s. G. S. Atwal and Co., the principal employers and the Union as also the workman concerned compromised the dispute, terms of which are reproduced as annexure "B" to this award. The workman is to be paid Rs. 1,000 in full and final settlement of the claim. The dispute is thus satisfactorily resolved and an award is recorded in terms of compromise settlement.

(Sd.) G. C. AGARWALA,  
Presiding Officer.  
26-12-1967.

**ANNEXURE "A"**

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
JABALPUR.**

**CAMP AT DHANBAD.**

**Dated July 21, 1967.**

**PRESENT:**

Sri G. C. Agarwala.—*Presiding Officer.*

1. REFERENCE No. 62 OF 1964 (DHANBAD TRIBUNAL)

REFERENCE No. CGIT/LC(R) (31)/67 (JABALPUR TRIBUNAL).

AND

2. REFERENCE No. 64 OF 1964 (DHANBAD TRIBUNAL)

REFERENCE No. CGIT/LC(R) (32)/67 (JABALPUR TRIBUNAL)

In the matter of an industrial dispute between the workmen and the employers of the concern known as Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and their Contractors, Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol) P.O. Kusunda (Dhanbad), Bihar.

**APPEARANCES:**

*For the employers.*—1. Sri J. N. P. Sahi, Asstt. Chief Labour Officer, East Indian Coal Co., Ltd., 2. Sri Mahabir Singh, Legal Adviser of M/s. G. S. Atwal and Co., (Asansol) P.O. Kusunda (Dhanbad).

*For the workmen.*—Sri Lalit Burman, Secretary Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mine.

DISTRICT: Dhanbad (Bihar).

## ORDER

By Notifications No. 2/44/64-LR. II dated 25th May, 1964, and No. 2/48/64-LR. II dated 3rd June, 1964, the Ministry of Labour and Employment referred the following two matters of dispute as stated in the schedule to the order of two separate references, to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad for adjudication from where both the cases were transferred to this Tribunal by Notification No. 8/25/67-LRII dated 25th April, 1967:—

## SCHEDULE

## 1. (Ref. No. 62/64-31/67).

Whether the action of the management of the Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company (1/12 Incline) and their Contractors Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company in transferring Shri Bajrangi Sah, Watchman, to Bararee Colliery and refusing to give him employment at Kenduadih Colliery (1/12 Incline) with effect from the 13th March, 1964, was justified? If not, to what relief is the workmen entitled?

## 2. (Ref. No. 64/64-32/67).

Whether the management of the Kenduadih Colliery (1/12 Incline) of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), their Raising and Selling Agents, were justified in terminating the services of Shri Ramchandra Sharma, Watchman, with effect from the 24th March, 1964? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

In both these cases which are between the same parties, common preliminary objections have been raised on behalf of the employers. The employers No. 1 are East India Coal Company Ltd., and employers No. 2 are M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company their Raising and Selling Contractors on Agents. The workmen in both are represented by the Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha—The dispute under reference No. 31/67 relates to the transfer of a workman, Bajrangi Shah, from Kenduadih Colliery to Bararee Colliery. In reference No. 32/67, the dispute is with regard to the termination of service of another watchman, Ramchandra Sharma, also of Kenduadih Colliery. Both the employers have raised a preliminary objection that the dispute is not an industrial dispute and is a individual dispute. This is a mixed question of law and fact and cannot be determined without calling for evidence and has to be postponed till evidence is recorded in the cases.

M/s. East Indian Coal Company Ltd., employers No. 1, raised a preliminary objection about the validity of the transfer of these cases from Dhanbad Tribunal to this Tribunal by the Central Government after the retirement of Shri Raj Kishore Prasad, the then Presiding Officer of Dhanbad Tribunal. This objection has not been pressed now on behalf of the employers and need not be considered.

Another objection raised by the Company, employers No. 1, is that the workmen concerned in both these cases were not their workmen but of the Raising and Selling Contractors, M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company. As such, it was contended that there was no industrial dispute between them and the workmen. This is again a question of fact to be determined by the evidence. The only legal objection which needs serious consideration is one raised by M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company by means of an application dated 17th July, 1967 filed in both the cases. It was urged that they having been contractors of M/s. East Indian Coal Company Ltd., and the dispute being between them and their workmen (Chotanagpur Coal Field Workers Union Vs. Kargali Colliery (1952-II-LLJ page 23); Bird and Co. Labour Union Vs. Bird and Co. Calcutta (1953-II-LLJ p. 774); Sri Goenka Mills and Shivpur Mill Mazdoor Sangh (1954-I-LLJ p. 149); and Pioneer Tile Works, Mangalore Vs. Narayan Shetty (B) and another (1956-I-LLJ p. 709). The real question in these cases was whether the workman concerned was an employee of contractor or not. The only case which has any relevancy is Carlsbad Mineral Water Mfg. Co. Ltd. Vs. P. K. Sarkar & others reported in 1952-I-LLJ p. 488. The Calcutta High Court in that case held that a dispute between a company manufacturing and supplying soda water to railway stations on an agreement with the East Indian Railway Administration, and their workmen was a dispute for which the State Government was the appropriate authority. It was held that such a business was not an industry owned by the Government and was not carried on by Government itself either through a department or

by some authority created by the Government to carry on that industry. In other words, it was not a Government industry. The railway company was no party to the reference. The point for consideration, therefore, was entirely a different one. In the instant case, the industry is a mine and coal is a controlled industry. From either point of view any matter between the workmen engaged in an industry either with the owners of the industry or with their agents or contractors and engaged in working the industry, the appropriate government would be the Central Government as defined in Sec. 2(a)(i) of the Act. M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company in one case No. 31/67 have been described as contractors and in the other case No. 32/67 they have been stated as Raising and Selling Agents. In para 5 of the written statement of M/s G. S. Atwal and Company in case No. 61/67 in which in the order of reference they have been stated as contractors, it was admitted by them that they were the Raising & Selling Agents of East India Coal Company. That being so, they are really the agents and not contractors. The "owner" as defined in Sec. 2(1) of the Mines Act includes managing agent of a company and any contractor for the working of a mine. Consequently M/s. G. S. Atwal & Company, by virtue of this definition shall be deemed to be owners under the Mines Act, 1952. The preliminary objection raised by M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company is, therefore, overruled.

(Sd.) G. C. AGARWALA,  
21-7-67.  
Presiding Officer.

Part of Award

(Sd.) G. C. AGARWALA,  
Presiding Officer.  
26-12-1967.

#### ANNEXURE 'B'

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR AT DHANBAD.

REFERENCE No. 31 OF 1967

#### PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Kenduadih Colliery (1/12&2/12 inclines)

AND

Their Workmen.

#### *Petition of compromise*

It is respectfully submitted as under:—

That the parties have mutually settled the above industrial dispute on the following terms.

#### *Terms of Settlement*

1. That Shri Bajrangi Shaw the workman concerned shall be paid a sum of Rs. 1000/- (Rupees one thousand) only in full and final settlement of all his claims.

2. That Shri Bajrangi Shaw shall be paid the amount of Rs. 1000, by M/s G. S. Atwal & Co. (Asansol) on or before the 11st February, 1968 and in case the employer fails to pay the same by 11th February, 1968, a sum of Rs. 15 per week shall be given to the workman as compensation till the final payment is made.

Under the circumstances, it is prayed that the above reference may be disposed of accordingly.

*For the Employers:*

Dated 23-12-67.

*For the Workmen:*

(Sd.) LALIT BURMAN,  
Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha.

(Sd.) MHABIR SINGH RANDHAWA,  
for G. S. Atwal & Co. (Asansol).

Verified

(Sd.) G. C. AGARWALA,  
23-12-67.

Part of Award

(Sd) BAJRANGI SHAH.

Sd/- (G. C. AGARWALA)  
Presiding Officer.  
Industrial Tribunal-cum Labour Court,  
(Central) Jabalpur.  
[No. 2/44/64-LRII.]



**S.O. 446.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to the Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), their Raising and Selling Agents, on the one part and their workmen on the other part, which was received by the Central Government on the 20th January, 1968.

**BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL  
TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR**

**CAMP AT CALCUTTA**

*Dated December 26, 1967*

**PRESENT:**

Sri G. C. Agarwala—Presiding Officer.

CASE REF. NO. 64 OF 1964 (DHANBAD TRIBUNAL)

CASE REF. NO. CGIT/LC(R)(32)/67 (JABALPUR TRIBUNAL)

**PARTIES:**

Employers in relation to Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), their Raising and Selling Agents, on one part,

*Versus*

Their Workmen represented through Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad.

**APPEARANCES:**

*For employers*—(1) Sri J. N. P. Sahl, Assistant Chief Labour Officer for East Indian Coal Co.

(2) Sri Maharbir Singh, for G. S. Atwal and Company.

*For Workmen*—Sri Lalit Barman, Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha, Dhanbad.

**INDUSTRY:** Coal Mine.

**DISTRICT:** Dhanbad (Bihar).

**AWARD**

By Notification No. 2/48/64-LR.II, dated 3-6-1964, the Ministry of Labour and Employment, Government of India, referred the following dispute, as stated in the schedule to the order of reference, to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, from where it was transferred to this Tribunal by Notification No. 8/25/67-LR.II, dated April 25, 1967.

*Matter of Dispute*

Whether the management of the Kenduadih Colliery (1/12 incline) of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), their Raising and Selling Agents, were justified in terminating the services of Shri Ramchandra Sharma, watchman, with effect from the 24th March, 1964? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

The parties filed their statements of claim before the Dhanbad Tribunal. After the case was transferred to this Tribunal certain legal objections were raised which were determined by an order dated 21st July, 1967 which is annexure "A" to the award.

When the case was taken up for hearing, the parties compromised the dispute, terms of which are reproduced as annexure "B" to the award. The dispute has been settled between the Raising Contractors who are the real employers Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company and the Union. The workman has to be paid Rs. 500 in full and final settlement of the claim. The dispute is thus satisfactorily resolved and an award is recorded in terms of compromise settlement.

(Sd.) G. C. AGARWALA,

Presiding Officer.

26-12-1967.

## ANNEXURE "A"

BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVT. INDUSTRIAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT,  
JABALPUR

CAMP AT DHANBAD

Dated July 21, 1967

## PRESENT:

Sri G. C. Agarwala—Presiding Officer.

1. REFERENCE No. 62 OF 1964 (DHANBAD TRIBUNAL)  
REFERENCE No. CGIT/LC(R)(32)/67 (JABALPUR TRIBUNAL)

AND

2. REFERENCE No. 64 OF 1964 (DHANBAD TRIBUNAL)  
REFERENCE No. CGIT/LC(R)(32)/67 (JABALPUR TRIBUNAL)

In the matter of an industrial dispute between the workmen and the employers of the concern known as Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and their Contractors, Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), P.O. Kusunda (Dhanbad), Bihar.

## APPEARANCES:

For the employers: 1. Sri J. N. P. Sahi, Asstt. Chief Labour Officer, East Indian Coal Co. Ltd.

2. Sri Mahabir Singh, Legal Adviser of Messrs G. S. Atwal & Co. (Asansol), P.O. Kusunda (Dhanbad).

For the workmen: Shri Lalit Burman Secretary, Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha.

INDUSTRY: Coal Mine.

DISTRICT: Dhanbad (Bihar).

## ORDER

By Notification No. 2/44/64-LR.II, dated 25th May, 1964 and No. 2/48/64-LR-II, dated 3rd June, 1964 the Ministry of Labour and Employment referred the following two matters of dispute as stated in the schedule to the order of two separate references, to the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, for adjudication from where both the cases were transferred to this Tribunal by Notification No. 8/25/67-LR.II, dated 25th April, 1967:—

## SCHEDULE

1. (Ref. No. 62/64-31/67).

Whether the action of the management of the Kenduadih Colliery of Messrs East Indian Coal Company (1/12 Incline) and their Contractors Messrs G.S. Atwal and Company in transferring Shri Bajrangi Shah, Watchman, to Bararee Colliery and refusing to give him employment at Kenduadih Colliery (1/12 Incline) with effect from the 13th March, 1964 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

2. (Ref. No. 64/64—32/67):

Whether the management of the Kenduadih Colliery (1/12 Incline) of Messrs East Indian Coal Company Limited and Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company (Asansol), their Raising and Selling Agents, were justified in terminating the services of Shri Ramchandra Sharma, Watchman, with effect from the 24th March, 1964? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

In both these cases which are between the same parties, common preliminary objections have been raised on behalf of the employers. The employers No. 1 are East Indian Coal Company Ltd., and employers No. 2 are Messrs G. S. Atwal and Company their Raising and Selling Contractors or Agents. The workmen in both are represented by the Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha. The dispute under reference No. 31/67 relates to the transfer of a workman, Bajrangi Shah, from Kenduadih Colliery to Bararee Colliery. In reference No. 32/67, the dispute is with regard to the termination of service of another watchman, Ramchandra Sharma, also of Kenduadih Colliery. Both the employers have raised a preliminary objection that the dispute is not an industrial dispute and is an individual dispute. This is a mixed question of law and fact and cannot be determined without calling for evidence and has to be postponed till evidence is recorded in the cases.

Messrs East Indian Coal Company Ltd., employers No. 1, raised a preliminary objection about the validity of the transfer of these cases from Dhanbad Tribunal to this Tribunal by the Central Government after the retirement of Sri Raj

Kishore Prasad, the then Presiding Officer of Dhanbad Tribunal. This objection has not been pressed now on behalf of the employers and need not be considered.

Another objection raised by the Company, employers No. 1, is that the workmen concerned in both these cases were not their workmen but of the Raising and Selling Contractors, M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company. As such, it was contended that there was no industrial dispute between them and the workmen. This is again a question of fact to be determined by the evidence. The only legal objection which needs serious consideration is one raised by M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company by means of an application dated 17th July, 1967 filed in both the cases. It was urged that they having been contractors of M/s. East Indian Coal Company Ltd., and the dispute being between them and their workmen, the Central Government was not the appropriate Government in relation to their establishment to make a reference to this Tribunal. In support of this argument a number of cases were cited but none of them is really on the point (Chotanagpur Coal Field Workers Union Vs. Kargali Colliery (1952-II-LLJ p. 23); Bird and Co., Labour Union Vs. Bird and Co., Calcutta (1953-II-LLJ p. 774); Sri Goenka Mills and Shivpur Mill Mazdoor Sangh (1954-I-LLJ p. 149); and Pioneer Tile Works, Mangalore Vs. Narayan Shetty (B) and another (1956-I-LLJ p. 709). The real question in these cases was whether the workman concerned was an employee of contractor or not. The only case which has any relevancy is Carlsbad Mineral Water Mfg. Co., Ltd., Vs. P. K. Sarkar and others reported in 1952-I-LLJ p. 488. The Calcutta High Court in that case held that a dispute between a company manufacturing and supplying soda water to railway stations on an agreement with the East Indian Railway Administration, and their workmen was a dispute for which the State Government was the appropriate authority. It was held that such a business was not an industry owned by the Government and was not carried on by Government itself either through a department or by some authority created by the Government to carry on that industry. In other words, it was not a Government industry. The railway company was no party to the reference. The point for consideration, therefore, was entirely a different one. In the instant case, the industry is a mine and coal is a controlled industry. From either point of view any matter between the workmen engaged in an industry either with the owners of the industry or with their agents or contractors and engaged in working the industry, the appropriate government would be the Central Government as defined in Section 2(a)(i) of the Act. M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company in one case No. 31/67 have been described as contractors and in the other case No. 32/67 they have been stated as Raising and Selling Agents. In para 5 of the written statement of M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company in case No. 31/67 in which in the order of reference they have been stated as contractors, it was admitted by them that they were the Raising and Selling Agents of East Indian Coal Company. That being so, they are really the agents and not contractors. The "owner" as defined in Section 2 (1) of the Mines Act includes managing agent of a company and any contractor for the working of a mine. Consequently M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company, by virtue of this definition shall be deemed to be owners under the Mines Act, 1952. The preliminary objection raised by M/s. G. S. Atwal and Company is, therefore, overruled.

(Sd.) G. C. AGGARWALA,  
Presiding Officer.  
21-7-1967.

Part of Award

Sd./- G. C. AGARWALA,  
Presiding Officer.  
26-12-1967.

#### ANNEXURE 'B'

BEFORE THE PRESIDING OFFICER, CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL-CUM-LABOUR COURT, JABALPUR AT DHANBAD

REF. No. 32 OF 1967.

#### PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Kenduadih Colliery (1/12 and 2/12 inclines)  
AND

Their workmen,  
Petition of compromise

It is respectfully submitted as under:—

That the parties have mutually settled the above industrial dispute on the following terms:—

#### Terms of Settlement

1. That Shri Ramchandra Sharma, the workman concerned shall be paid a sum of Rs. 500 (Rupees five hundred) only in full and final settlement of all his claims.

2. That Shri Ramchandra Sharma shall be paid the amount of Rs. 500 by M/s G. S. Atwal and Co., (Asansol) on or before 11th February, 1968 and in case the employer fails to pay the same by 11th February, 1968 a sum of Rs. 15 per week shall be given to the workman as compensation till the final payment is made.

Under the circumstances, it is prayed that the above reference may be disposed of accordingly.

Dated 23rd December, 1967.

For the Workman.

Bihar Koyla Mazdoor Sabha.

For the Employers.  
(Sd.) M. S. RANDHAWALA,  
For G. S. ATWAL, & Co.  
(Asansol).

Verified.  
Sd./- G. C. AGARWALA.  
23-12-1967

Part of Award

Sd./- G. C. AGARWALA,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal-Cum-Labour Court,  
(Central) Jabalpur.  
[No. 2/48/64-LR-II.]

### (Department of Labour & Employment)

#### ORDERS

*New Delhi, the 19th January 1968*

**S.O. 447**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the New Selected Dhori Colliery and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of New Selected Dhori Colliery in stopping Shri Maheshwar Prasad Ambasta Clerk, from work with effect from the 7th May, 1967 was justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No 2/160/67-LRII.]

*New Delhi, the 25th January 1968*

**S.O. 448**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Messrs Shaw Wallace and Company Limited, Parasla, District Chhindwara (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the action of the management of Messrs Shaw Wallace and Company Limited, Post Office Parasla, District Chhindwara (Madhya

Pradesh) in stopping from work Shri Sarfaraz Khan son of Ramzan, Pump Khalasi Wallace Pit, Chhindwara (Madhya Pradesh) with effect from the 26th September 1967 is justified? If not, to what relief is the workman entitled?

[No. 5/88/67-LRII.]

**S.O. 449.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Umaria Colliery of Messrs Rewa Coalfields Limited, Post Office Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh) and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication,

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Jabalpur, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the proposed closure of the Umaria Colliery of Messrs Rewa Coalfields Limited, Post Office, Dhanpuri, District Shahdol (Madhya Pradesh), and the retrenchment of 435 of its workmen from the 31st January 1968 are justified? If not, to what relief are the workmen entitled?

[No. 8/11/68-LRII.]

#### CORRIGENDUM

*New Delhi, the 25th January 1968*

**S.O. 450.**—In the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) notification No. S.O. 1700, dated the 6th May, 1967 published at pages 1695 to 1698 in the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3(ii), dated the 13th May, 1967—

at page 1696, in paragraph 3, line 9 of the Award, for “1967” occurring after the word “1st April” read “1966”.

(Sd.) MOHAMMAD NAJMUDDIN,  
Chairman,  
Industrial Tribunal, Andhra Pradesh,  
Hyderabad.  
[No. 7/9/66-LRII.]

BALWANT SINGH, Under Secy.

#### (Department of Labour & Employment)

*New Delhi, the 20th January 1968*

**S.O. 451.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of Shri P. C. Rai, Arbitrator in the dispute between the Balaghat Mines of Bhilai Steel Plant of Messrs Hindustan Steel Limited and their workmen represented by Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh which was received by the Central Government on the 17th January, 1968.

Arbitration Award of Shri P. C. Rai, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Jabalpur in the case of S/Sri Narayan Nair and Sadhan Chandra of Balaghat Mine of Bhilai Steel Plant.

RLC File No. J-83(34)/67

M/L&E File No. 37/16/67-LRI.

PRESENT:

Shri P. C. Rai, Regional Labour Commissioner (C) Arbitrator.

*Representing Employers.*—Shri M. R. Raju, Sr. Labour Officer (Conciliation).

*Representing the Employees.*—1. Shri P. K. Thakur, Vice-President, Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh

## 2. Shri Nutaneswar, Secretary, Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh.

Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation, Deptt. of Labour and Employment, by Notification No. 37/16/67-LRI, dated 2nd November 1967 published an order in the Gazette of India, which included an agreement under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. By this order the dispute was referred to my arbitration. The following is the relevant portion of the agreement:—

"It is hereby agreed between the parties to refer the following industrial dispute to the arbitration of Shri P. C. Rai, Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Jabalpur.

- (i) *Specific matters in dispute.*—Whether the action of the management in not promoting S/Sri Narayan Nair and Sadhan Chandra Rigman as drillmen in the scale of Rs 150—210 is discriminatory? If so, to what relief the workmen are entitled.
- (ii) *Details of the parties to the dispute.*—M/s. Hindustan Steel Limited in relation to their Balaghat Mines of Bhilai Steel Plant, Bhilai, Distt. Durg (M. P.)

AND

Their workmen represented through the Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (AITUC) Tirodi, Distt. Balaghat (M.P.)

- (iii) *Name of the Union, if any, representing the workmen in question.*—Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh (AITUC), P.O. Tirodi, Distt. Balaghat.

- (iv) *Total number of workmen employed in the undertaking affected.*—150.

- (v) *Estimated number of workmen affected or likely to be affected by the dispute.*—2 (Two only).

The arbitrator shall make his award within a period of three months or within such further time as is extended by mutual agreement between us in writing. In case the award is not made within the period aforementioned, the reference to arbitration shall stand automatically cancelled and we shall be free to negotiate for fresh arbitration."

In response to my request Bhilai Steel Plant and Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh submitted their written statements on 17th November 1967 and 30th October 1967 with copies to opposite parties. Hearing in the case was fixed on 2nd December 1967 but it was adjourned on telegraphic request of Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh. Final hearing in the arbitration was made on 12th December 1967 in my Jabalpur office.

2. The Union submitted that S/Sri Karunakaran and Mathal were promoted as Rigmen Gr. III N. M. R. from 1st February 1962 (85—110 scale) whereas S/Sri S. Chandra and Narayan were Rigmen from 1st February 1961. In 1965 the cases of S/Sri Narayan Nair and Sadhan Chandra were seized in conciliation. In support of these facts the Union produced minutes of conciliation dated 11th June 1965 and their letter dated 19th May 1965 and SOMQ, B.S.P. order dated 12th December 1962 and SOMQ order dated 2nd March 1961. They further submitted that the General Manager was addressed by their letter dated 17th November 1965 and requested for a quick decision. On 18th October 1966, the Union addressed the Regional Labour Commissioner (Central), Jabalpur and requested that the matter of promotion of Narayan Nair and Sadhan Chandra be taken as industrial dispute. The Assistant Labour Commissioner (Central), Jabalpur held discussions on 13th December 1966 and the parties agreed to settle the matter mutually failing which the matter was to be resolved by arbitration under Section 10-A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947. The Union submitted a note of discussions dated 3rd January 1967 recording failure of mutual discussions. The Union submitted copy of transfer order according to which all 4 persons viz S/Shri Sadhan Chandra, E. V. Narayan, Karunakaran and Mathal were transferred to prospecting zone I, Balaghat Mines. S/Shri Sadhan Chandra and Narayan carried out their transfer orders in good faith but S/Sri Karunakaran and Mathal were retained at Rajhara despite these orders. Ostensibly this was to facilitate their promotion superseding the rights of S/Sri Sadhan Chandra and Narayan Nair. The Union further produced Order No. Estt-IX-5(b)/1(E)(4)/1964/7688 dated 12th September 1964 in support of their submission. According to these orders S/Sri Mathal and Karunakaran were promoted to Drillmen w.e.f.

12th September 1964. S/Sri Sadhan Chandra and Narayan Nair were not promoted and their cases were not considered. Even trade test notice was not given to them and they being senior their claims were superseded in the none too fair method. On 5th April 1967 the Personnel Officer of Bhilai Steel Plant (Mines) wrote a letter to the A.L.C.(C), Jabalpur stating that the dispute should not be referred to arbitration as is reference will give rise to chain of claim reactions. The Union contended that all these things happened at the back of the union and therefore the wrong which was by implication accepted by the management was attempted to be scorched on the plea that it may give rise to chain claim reaction amongst the other employees. In these backgrounds the management offered a trade test by a circular letter dated 19th December 1966 which was new thing though the dispute was in existence since 1965. The Union submitted a settlement dated 8th February 1965 regarding the case of Shri Chacko to prove that the entire prospecting in Rajhara Nandini and Balaghat was treated as one unit. Shri Chacko's case was an identical case. He was a drillman at Nandini Lime Stone Mine whereas his promotion to chageman had taken Place at Rajhara in which a junior workman had been promoted to a post in supersession of a chageman. Then a settlement had been arrived at wherein Shri Chacko was promoted to chageman from retrospective date with arrear payment etc. So this proved that Rajhara, Nandini and Balaghat were treated as one Prospecting Unit. The union produced an order No. OMQ/11/(b)/9/63 dated 11th April 1963 of the management according to which emoluments of S/Sri Sadhan Chandra and E. V. Narayan were Rs. 89/- whereas those of S/Shri Karunakaran and Mathai were Rs. 87/- only. This according to the union proved that S/Shri Sadhan Chandra and Naraya Nair were senior to S/Sri Karunakaran and Mathai. In view of the above, the union submitted that S/Sri Sadhan Chandra and Narayan should deem to be promoted to the post of drillmen from 12th September 1964 with all attendant benefits i.e., pay scale, D.A. Mining Allowance.

3. The management submitted that the union has made a basic error in pointing out seniority of S/Shri Sadhan Chandra and Narayan Nair. S/Sri Karunakaran and Mathai were senior to S/Sri Sadhan Chandra and Narayan Nair. According to Order dated 2nd March 1961 S/Sri Narayan and Sadhan Chandra were promoted on W/C Establishment from N.M.R. on 1st February 1961 and by an order dated 12th February 1961 S/sri Karunakaran and Mathai were promoted to Rigmen Gr. III from N.M.R. on 1st February 1962.

4. The management representative raised a preliminary objection that the name of Shri Narayan Nair was incorrectly recorded in the arbitration agreement. There was no such person. As the correct name was Shri E. V. Narayan. So I asked the parties to proceed with the case of Shri E. V. Narayan as the union also have mentioned that name and the record also pertains to Shri E. V. Narayan.

5. The management representative contended that at no stage the right of the workmen under dispute was infringed or they have been discriminated in the matter of promotion. Their transfer was effected in the year 1963 (20th September 1963) and the persons alleged to have been promoted were "selected" at the Rajhara Mines w.e.f 12th September 1964, much later than the transfer had taken place. There was no mala fide intention. Prospecting Division as such is a temporary division and is meant for exploring mineral deposit at various places. At the instance of the same union manning has been done at particular plan and actual number of persons were locally employed as per advice of the Industrial Engineering Deptt. after they were declared fit to be absorbed on trade test etc. This procedure has since been adopted on the insistence of the same Union of Nandini Mines which threatened for direct action if the management did not concede to this demand, the major one being the promotion of personnel from existing staff at Nandini Office. The various posts and wage structure applicable have been notified against a notice of change under Section 9A of the I.D Act from time to time. Thereafter the personnel have been selected for that, that is the union for reason for best known to it did not object at any stage to this procedure and policy adopted by the management to bring specified categories on the regular scales of pay locally at Rajhara, and Nandini Mines nor did it raise a demand for the Mine workers to be combined with other employees of Rajhara, Nandini Hirri etc. It is in this context that it is quite evident that the management's action is justified and is based on sound personnel policy. The alleged discrimination and supersession has no bearing whatsoever with any of the promotion or selection considered after the study of the manpower required at a particular place and against man power force demand policy adopted in the matter of selection and placement. The demand of the union is not only belated but also wholly unreasonable and untenable. The facts mentioned above can be further elaborated by the reply No. Estt. 19(5)/BNM/64/4762 dated 28th December 1964 which

contains a reply to the Union's letter of 28/31st October 1964. The management's letter No. Estt.19(5)/BNM/64/4762 dated 28th December 1964 indicates the procedure of treating different establishment as separate entities for the purpose of seniority and promotion having due consideration of the continued agitation and demands. The general demand of the prospecting staff followed by the pay strike notice as per letter No. SKMS (NM)/1(73)/64 dated 28/31st October 1964 also is illustrative of the fact cited above. On 18th May 1965, workmen of Nandini had given a threat of pay strike and the same was followed by the Union's letter No. SKMS (NM)/1(73)/64 dated 28/31st October 1964. On 3rd June 1965 workmen gave condition for settlement of the agitation. The union has quoted the case of Shri Chacko to signify claim of a common seniority of the staff of prospecting units. It is absolutely irrelevant and has no bearing on the the dispute in question. On the contrary, it confirms the policy of the management regarding treating different establishments for the purpose of promotion etc., as is evident from Clause 2 of the Memorandum of Settlement dated 18th February 1965. The management submitted a copy of notice of change dated 22nd August 1964 and a copy of notice dated 18th January 1965 for indicating the line of promotion of Rigmens at Nandini Mine only.

6. The management further submitted that the trade test at Rajhara had accordingly been done and the pannel were selected and not promoted on the basis of the trade test results and hence intimation to Balaghat Prospecting where the disputants have been employed does not arise. Even if the workmen were not summoned for trade test the union/workmen cannot interfere with the managerial function as have been upheld in the case of *R. Sampat Vs. State of Madras* represented by the Secretary to the Govt. of Madras Revenue Department (1962 FLR262). Similarly in the case of *Brook Bond (India) Pvt. Ltd., Vs. their workmen* (431 1963—LLJ. 256—Sonavalla's Book Chapter X—Pp. 468-469).

7. It is finally submitted that any change or deviation from the established and hitherto continued policy of personnel management again is definitely undermine the whole situation giving rise to several disputes and as such Honourable Arbitrator is requested to not concede to the demand of the union.

8. The union made further submission that the management tried to impress on the following points—

Regarding name—Narayanan has been spelt as Narayan.

(ii) On the insistence of the various unions mines have been taken to be units for the purpose of the promotion. Nandini Branch union had raised a dispute which was dealt with at the Branch level. If the matter was a combined one for Rajhara, Nandini, Hirri and Balaghat mine then this would have served as an estoppel. But this not being so, cannot be brought against the workmen working in the mine other than Nandini. The letter no. SKMS (NM)/8/(a)/9/65/168 dated 2nd June 1965 has been signed by Shri C. R. Bakshi, President of Samyukta Khadan Mazdoor Sangh, Nandini Branch. So raising this against the workmen of Balaghat is an exercise in futility. Letter No. SKMS(NM)/1(73)/64 dated 28/31st October 1964 is a statement of demands regarding Shri Chacko. On the managements demand a reply and is followed by a settlement which has been produced by the union. The reply of the management is superseded by the settlement dated 18th February 1965. According to this settlement the contention has been substantially accepted by the management so the management is stopped from raising that plea.

(iii) Management's notice of change dated 28th August 1964 relates to scale of pay. It does not deal with transfer from one mine to another. The management's action is again futile.

(iv) According to the letter No. OMQ/II(b)/5/IV/63/9338 dated 20th September 1963 these 4 workmen were all transferred from Balaghat to Rajhara though they were appointed at Balaghat.

(v) On 20th September 1963 all were transferred to Balaghat but only 2 carried out the orders were punished and the remaining 2 were subsequently promoted. The management has not been able to substantiate by any document that withholding of transfer order in relation to Karunakaran and Mathai and therefore their retention at Rajhara was illegal and mala fide. But by retention of the workmen—Sadhan Chandra and Narayan would have got promotion.

(vi) The management did not produce any documents to prove that they the two workmen S/Sri Karunakaran and Mathai passed trade test. So



denying promotion is an unfair practice and is mala fide. This was an unfair practice and not a managerial function.

9. Regarding repercussion the union made a submission that a wrong is wrong will be wrong irrespective of what it may entail. If repercussion had to be thought of they must have been thought of in 1964 and not to-day.

10. The management representative further submitted as follows:—

- (i) The representative reiterated his earlier stand regarding the name of Shri Narayan.
- (ii) Para 4 of the written statement of the union is in contradiction with the argument in Item No. (ii) of the argument of the union.
- (iii) The management's contention was the words 'retained' and remained have two different meanings.

11. The union made clear that these words had been intentionally used with their usual meanings.

12. The parties had no other submission to make at this stage.

13. Date of appointment as Rigmen of—

- (1) Shri Karunakaran, 1st February 1962.
- (2) Shri Mathai, 1st February 1962
- (3) Shri E. V. Narayan 1st February 1961
- (4) Shri Sadhan Chandra, 1st February 1961.

During the course of hearing the parties agreed that the Award may be given by 15th January 1968.

14. After taking the facts of the case and arguments of the parties mentioned above I have come to the conclusion that there has been discrimination in the matter of promotion in respect of S/Shri E. V. Narayan and Sadhan Chandra. These persons were senior, their date of appointment was 1st February 1961 whereas the date of appointment of S/Shri Karunakaran and Mathai was 1st February 1962. S/Shri Sadhan Chandra and E. V. Narayan were not treated at par in the matter of promotion with their other colleagues S/Shri Karunakaran and Mathai due to their posting at Balaghat. The argument put forward by the management do not seem to be convincing as the letters/orders/notice etc. refer to the period after the promotion of S/Shri Karunakaran and Mathai. I am therefore inclined to accept the contention of the union and award that S/Shri Sadhan Chandra and E. V. Narayan should be promoted and treated as senior to S/Shri Karunakaran and Mathai. Consequential arrear dues as a result of promotion from 12th September 1964 should also be paid to S/Sri E. V. Narayan and Sadhan Chandra.

15. The management will, no doubt, make suitable adjustments in the seniority of the other Rigmen as a consequence of my above award.

(Sd.) P. C. RAI,

Regional Labour Commissioner (Central) Jabalpur,  
Jabalpur, dated the 8th January 1968.

Arbitrator,

[No. 37/16/67-LRI.]

New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968

S.O. 452.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 4 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour, Employment and Rehabilitation (Department of Labour and Employment) No. S.O. 1300, dated the 5th April, 1967,—

In the Table annexed to the said notification,—after Serial No. 38 and the entries relating thereto, the following Serial No. and entries shall be inserted, namely:—

“38A. Assistant Labour Commissioner  
(Central), Bhubaneswar.

The State of Orissa and the civil districts of  
Burdwan, Bhirbhum, Bankura and Purulia  
in West Bengal.”

[No. F. 1/3/68-LRI.]

**S.O. 453.**—In pursuance of Section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji and Company, Bombay, and their workmen, which was received by the Central Government on the 15th January, 1968.

# BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL BOMBAY

REFERENCE No. CGIT-18 OF 1965

## PARTIES:

Employers in relation to Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co. Bombay

AND

Their workmen.

## PRESENT:

Shri A. T. Zambre, Presiding Officer.

## APPEARANCES:

*For the employers*—Shri P. H. Purav, Labour Adviser with Shri S. T. Shah, Assistant Manager of the Company.

*For the workmen*—Shri K. A. Khan, Secretary, Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Bombay.

STATE: Maharashtra.

INDUSTRY: Major Ports (Clearing and Forwarding).

*Bombay, dated the 29th December 1967*

## AWARD

By Order No. 28/78/64-LRIV dated 19th March 1965 the Central Government in the Ministry of Labour and Employment referred for adjudication to this Tribunal the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co. and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the following schedule:—

## SCHEDULE

"Whether the following demands of 20 Cart unloaders employed by Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji and Company, Bombay, are justified? If so, to what relief are they entitled?

1. The Piece-Rate Scheme prepared by Jeejeebhoy Committee and at present in force in respect of Cart and Wagon Unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust should be made applicable to the Cart Unloaders with immediate effect.
2. All other service conditions i.e. Provident Fund, Gratuity, Privilege Leave, Dearness Allowance and annual paid holidays made applicable to the shore gangs should also be made applicable to the Cart Unloaders with immediate effect."

2. The employers, Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co., Bombay, are working as contractors to Messrs. Scindia Steam Navigation Co. Ltd., and Bombay Steam Navigation Co. Ltd. They have been provided with special berths in the Princess Docks to carry on all the works in connection with loading and unloading of the cargo similar to that being done by the Bombay Port Trust in the rest of the docks. The employers also work as clearing agents and stevedores in the Bombay Port and have a large number of employees consisting of different categories.

3. In the year 1954 the Central Government referred an industrial dispute (Ref. No. ITCG-4 of 1954) between the Bombay Port Trust and various labour contractors doing business in the Bombay Port and Docks on the one hand and their workmen on the other to the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay. The present employers Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co., were also party to the reference. Amongst their employees the cart unloaders were also involved in that dispute and were concerned workmen. By the award which was given by the Labour Appellate Tribunal in the year 1956 as a result of the reference the cart loaders and unloaders were given a piece-rate wage system with Rs. 15/- as retention allowance. The Transport and Dock Workers' Union has now contended that in spite of the fact that great many changes had taken place in the wages as well as service conditions of all other dock workers in the port of Bombay the workers of this category in the service of the employers have been suffering heavily for the last so many years as a result of poor earnings and in their case there was a

virtual wage freeze. Hence the Transport and Dock Workers' Union, Bombay, submitted a charter of demands to the employers requesting them to effect a drastic change in the wage rates of the employees, apply the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee to the cart unloaders and further requested them to apply all other service conditions applicable to the shore gangs to these categories viz., cart unloaders. The dispute was also referred to conciliation but there was no settlement and ultimately it has been referred to this Tribunal.

3. The union has by its written statement contended that the cart unloaders have been suffering heavily for many years as a result of very poor earnings. They have also no other service conditions worth the name and the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee and made applicable to the cart unloaders and wagon loaders of the Bombay Port Trust and presently in force should be applied to them.

4. They have alleged that the employers are functioning as almost a parallel organisation to the Bombay Port Trust and have a muster roll of about one thousand workers and they perform identical jobs on the shore as performed by the Bombay Port Trust. That in the award in Ref. No. 4 of 1954 the shore workers including the cart unloaders were treated on par for all the purposes and as the workmen are performing identical duties as the unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust the piece-rate scheme evolved for the Bombay Port Trust's workmen by Shri Jeejeebhoy should be made applicable to them. It has been further contended that during a period of ten years there has been overall change in the service conditions of the employees of Messrs. Scindia Steam Navigation Co. and in the contract rates between the contractors and the shipping companies and the workmen were entitled to improvement in the service conditions by introducing provident fund, gratuity, privilege leave etc., and prayed that the employers may be directed to give the service conditions as may be awarded in Ref. No. 13/1965 which was pending.

5. The employers have by their written statement dated 20th May, 1965 opposed the demands and have contended that the wages of the cart unloaders employed by the company had been the subject matter of industrial dispute Ref. No. 4/1954 which has been finally decided by the Labour Appellate Tribunal. The award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal was subsisting and still in force. That the employers had also pressed before the Conciliator that the wages were covered by the subsisting award and the present reference was therefore bad in law. They have further contended that the second part of the charter of demands relating to conditions of service was vague, that the company was not earning anything out of the work of unloading and that its financial position had remained unchanged since the decision of the Labour Appellate Tribunal and as such for reasons given by the Labour Appellate Tribunal in para 214 of its award the demands did not merit any acceptance.

6. During the pendency of this reference the Sole Proprietress of the employers Smt. Velbai Kanji died on 21st September 1967. The company made an application on 7th November 1967 for bringing the Administrator of the estate of the deceased on the record of this reference. This application has been granted and Shri Mathuradas Gokuldas who has been appointed by the Hon'ble High Court as Administrator has been brought on record.

7. The learned Counsel for the employers has raised preliminary objections to the maintainability of the reference and has contended that the award passed in Ref. No. 4/1954 which pertains to demand No. 1 was subsisting at the time of the reference. It had not been terminated and as there is no dispute in law between the parties the reference is bad and is not maintainable. It has been further alleged by their written statement dated 6th November 1967 that the 20 workers in respect of whom the reference has been made are not now working with the employers as cart unloaders and as the concerned cart unloaders are not now in the employ of the company the reference is not tenable.

(1) Learned Counsel for the employers has argued on the legal and technical objections raised by the employers that the Tribunal should frame preliminary issues about the maintainability of the reference and only after deciding those issues the reference should be heard on merits. Learned Counsel has also given an application in that respect and has invited my attention to the authority reported in 1962 II LLJ p. 732 (Kirkoskar Bros. Ltd., and its workmen) and has submitted that the Tribunal has no power to proceed without giving findings on these issues. In the above case the question was whether the word "workmen" included not only the workmen of the machine factory but also those employed in the company's press which was claimed to be an independent business. In the headnote of this ruling it is stated that in regard to the third contention it was held that the Industrial Tribunal should not have proceeded to decide the reference on

merits in regard to the employees of the press without deciding the plea of the company that its press was an independent business separate and distinct from its factory.

(2) I do not think that this ruling will be applicable to the facts of the present case. It shall have to be remembered that the decision of each case is governed by its own facts and circumstances involved. No principle of law has been laid down and I do not think that in every case, it is necessary to decide the preliminary issues before other issues. If circumstances require then all the issues can be heard together. The representative of the union has pressed to decide all the issues together. He has argued that the employers are hard litigants. In the other reference they had even filed a suit against the Tribunal in the City Civil Court, Bombay and had obtained an injunction and by the request to decide preliminary issues they want to prolong the proceedings. It is clear that in this case the union had given notice of its demands to the company on 12th June 1964 and the matter was referred to this Tribunal on 19th March 1965. The reference has been pending since long and if only a finding on the preliminary points is given the parties will try to prolong the proceedings and considering the circumstances I do not think that there would be any injustice in hearing the parties on all the issues together.

(3) It is an admitted fact that in the year 1954 there was a general dispute between all the dock workers on the one hand and their employers the Port Trust of Bombay, the Dock Labour Board, the Stevedores' Association and the labour contractors. It was in regard to wages. It was adjudicated by the Industrial Tribunal, Bombay (Ref. IT-CG 4 of 1954) and on appeal was finally decided by the L.A.T. in 1958 and in the award the wage system was changed and in respect of some of the employees such as the shore workers and stevedore workers the system was replaced by a piece-rate scheme. The workers involved in the present reference were also included in that proceeding and the award was binding on them but before the present reference no notice was given by the union terminating the award which was subsisting and the question is whether the present reference is bad on that account.

(4) It has been argued on behalf of the union that Ref. No. 4 of 1954 concerned about four thousand workers. It consisted of many categories of employees. The union was in doubt whether an award can be terminated partly and hence no notice was given. It has been submitted that by the demand the union had conveyed the intention of the workers to the company. The award has been subsequently terminated by a notice and this contention cannot be considered.

(5) The learned Counsel for the employers has invited my attention to the provisions of section 19(6) of the Industrial Disputes Act and the observations of their Lordships of the Supreme Court in the ruling reported in 1961 1LLJ p. 210 (Aluminium Factory Workers' Union and Indian Aluminium Co. Ltd.) in which it was held that the provision in the earlier awards that supervisors shall not be deemed to be workmen was clearly incidental to the points of reference and the appeal was dismissed. In this case also their Lordships have not laid down any proposition of law about the maintainability of the reference without termination of the existing award. The earlier award was in respect of the status of the party as supervisor. There is no evidence that subsequently that award was terminated by a notice as in this case and the ruling will not be applicable.

(6) Moreover the existence of an award binding on the parties will not make the reference bad in law. Section 19(6) of the Industrial Disputes Act merely lays down that the award shall continue to be binding on the parties until a period of two months has elapsed from the date on which notice is given by any party bound by the award to the other party or parties intimating its intention to terminate the award. This would at the most mean that the party who has not terminated the award may not be entitled to get the relief he asks for if the same is covered by the award but it would not in any way render the reference made by the Government to the Tribunal bad.

(7) The present reference is made under section 10(1)(d) which provides:—

10(1) "Where the appropriate Government is of opinion that any industrial dispute exists or is apprehended, it may at any time by order in writing—

(d) refer the dispute or any matter appearing to be connected with, or relevant to the dispute whether it relates to any matter specified in the Second Schedule or the Third Schedule to a Tribunal for adjudication."

There is nothing in the section which requires the Government to hold an enquiry whether the previous award is binding upon the parties or not. They are con-

difference of opinion between the employers and the employees and there is a likelihood of any disturbance there arises a dispute which can be referred by the Government to the authority concerned and the validity or otherwise of the reference should not be dependent upon the question whether a party is entitled to any relief. It has been observed in the ruling reported in 1953 1 LLJ p. 174 (State of Madras versus C. P. Sarathy and another):—

"Following the decision of the Federal Court in the Paper Pulp case (1949 1 LLJ p. 258), the Court held that while it is desirable that in making a reference Government should indicate the nature of the dispute it must be remembered that Government acting under section 10 is doing an administrative act and the fact that it has to form an opinion as to the factual existence of the dispute as a preliminary step to discharge its functions does not make it any the less administrative in character and the court cannot canvass the order closely as if it was a judicial or quasi-judicial act; that while it will be open to a party to impugn an award on the ground that what was referred was not an industrial dispute the fact of its existence and propriety of reference were matters entirely for Government and a Court cannot quash the proceedings merely because in its opinion Government had no material to come to that conclusion. Government must have power in the interests of industrial peace and production to set the machinery of settlement in motion without pausing to enquire what the specific points of dispute are."

Considering these observations, I do not think that the mere fact that the previous award between the parties was binding would be sufficient to throw away this reference as bad in law.

(8) It cannot be ignored that the Industrial Disputes Act has been enacted with a view to make provision for the investigation and settlement of industrial disputes. It further cannot be ignored that the breaking up of industrial disputes does not depend upon the existence of binding contracts or awards. Disputes are generally the result of the change of circumstances and take a graver turn causing strikes when remedies are not available by ordinary means and Government has to refer the disputes for settlements in spite of the binding contracts or awards and the Tribunals have to consider the justification of the demands on various grounds. The Industrial Disputes Act does not prohibit a reference when a binding contract or an award which is a statutory contract is in existence and I do not think that I shall be justified in dismissing the reference *in limine*.

(9) The reference has been further challenged on the contention that the 20 cart unloaders who had raised the dispute are no more in the employ of the company. The reference does not survive and the same should be rejected. It is true that in the schedule attached to the order there is reference to the demands of 20 cart unloaders employed by the company and some of them were promoted as shore workers and were no unloaders. However, it is clear that in all there were only 20 employees working with the company as cart unloaders. Learned Counsel has admitted this fact. The cause of these unloaders was represented by the union. The grievance was not only of the 20 persons as such but it was of all the workers of the category of cart unloaders and the mere fact that all of them or some of them have been promoted as shore workers and are replaced by others will not render the reference invalid.

(10) It is significant to remember that under section 18 of the Industrial Disputes Act the award of a Labour Court, Tribunal or National Tribunal which has become enforceable is binding on the parties to the industrial dispute, and where the party referred to in this clause is composed of workmen it is binding on all persons who were employed in the establishment or part of the establishment to which the dispute related on the date of the dispute and also all persons who subsequently become employed in that establishment or part. The employees of the company who are at present working as cart and wagon unloaders have given an application that they are the members of the union, they were getting low wages and were parties to the dispute. In view of the provisions of section 18 of the Act even the employees who joined the establishment subsequently are interested in the proceedings and the mere fact that the workmen who were actually working with the company at the time of the dispute have left will not render it useless. The workers have been replaced by others and the reference survives and the same is maintainable.

8. The Transport and Dock Workers' Union has on behalf of the cart and wagon unloaders contended that these workers have been suffering very heavily

for the last many years as a result of their poor earnings. They are getting wage rates as per the award of the Labour Appellate Tribunal of the year 1956. Many changes have taken place in the wages as well as service conditions of other dock workers and the company should make a drastic change in the wage rates and the service conditions of these workers. They have submitted that the cart and wagon unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust are getting wages as per piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee and have demanded that the unloaders of the company should also be given wages as per the same scheme and other service conditions such as provident fund, gratuity, dearness allowance, leave etc., should be made applicable to them.

9. The employers have contended that they were merely labour contractors to the Scindia Steam Navigation Co., and their establishment should not be compared with the Bombay Port Trust which is a statutory body having powers to levy taxes and the company has not the financial capacity to bear the burden of the revision of the wage system of the unloader. It has been further contended that the company is not earning out of the work of loading and unloading; whatever amount is received by them for this type of work from Messrs. Scindia Steam Navigation Co., is passed on to the workers. There is no profit in the work and the demands of the workmen about increase in the wages and the service conditions about provident fund, gratuity, dearness allowance etc., are not justified.

10. In support of their contention the employers have examined Shri J. G. Bhat, their dock supervisor in the Princess Dock who has stated the Scindia Steam Navigation Co., pays to the employers 31 paise per ton for unloading of the cargo from the trucks and the company pays to the unloaders a piece-rate of 22 paise per ton together with a retention allowance of Rs. 15 per month. They were also paying to the employees extra shift allowance, overtime allowance and the company is required to spend 39 paise per ton. The company has also produced a certificate from the Scindia Steam Navigation Co., to show that they are getting 31 paise per ton for the cargo handled by them. However, they have not examined any person in authority from the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. and the truthfulness of the contents of the certificate has not been proved and the question is whether the demand of the workmen should be rejected on the contention regarding financial inability of the employers.

11. It is true that the Bombay Port Trust is a statutory body having certain powers under the Port Trust Act. However, it cannot be disputed that the employers Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co., are running almost a parallel organisation and doing the same business in the docks and in the Port. They have not produced any evidence from their books of accounts or other returns to show their financial position and there is absolutely no proof that they are unable to meet the demands of the 10 workers who are working as unloaders with them. It will not be out of place to quote here the observations of the learned Adjudicator Shri Salim M. Merchant in his award in Reference CGIT-13 of 1965 where he has considered the demands of the workmen of the present employers regarding provident fund, bonus, leave etc. It appears that the employers had taken a similar plea before him and the learned Adjudicator has observed in paragraph 14 of his award as follows:—

"Before dealing with the merits of the dispute, I may state that Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co., which is a proprietary concern besides doing the work of stevedores is a contractor of Messrs. Scindia Steam Navigation Co., and enjoys certain privileges which have been noticed by the Labour Appellate Tribunal in paragraph 206 of its decision. This company has acquired a special position in the Bombay Docks and has been allotted special berths in the Princess Dock and does the work of loading and unloading cargo etc., similar to that of the Bombay Port Trust in the rest of the docks. In addition as stated earlier the company is also doing work as clearing and forwarding agents for cement companies and has the right to deal with the passenger traffic of their principals in the docks. It was stated at the hearing that in all its business the company engages about 1,000 workmen. Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji have their branches at Karachi in Pakistan, New Kandla, Cutch Mandvi, Porbander and Bhavnagar. It carries on business as freight brokers, stevedores and contractors of the Scindia Steam Navigation Co., and acts as agents to the International Air Transport Association and Indian Airlines Corporation."

This will show the extent of the business of the company and their position in the business world. Had the company been incapable of meeting the demands of these ten workers they would not have failed to produce the statement of their accounts showing the profits earned by them or losses incurred and the contention about financial inability cannot be accepted.

12. It was alleged that the company was getting only 31 paise per ton and was passing on the whole amount to the workmen and was not earning any profit from this work. However, the witness Shri Bhat whom the company has examined to prove this fact has admitted that he has no personal knowledge about the terms of the contract between the employers and the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. It has come in evidence that formerly the employers were getting 25 paise per ton from the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. However, Shri Bhat has no personal knowledge whether the company was getting 25 paise per ton before 3rd March 1956. Though the witness has in his affidavit stated that the work of the cart unloading department of the employers was independent of the other work of the company he has not even seen the copy of the contract which the employers had taken from the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. He has further admitted that the employers have not got any unloading department as such but it is merely a section. It is clear that the employers are working as labour contractors to the B.S.N. line and the cart unloading may be one of the items of works carried on for the B.S.N. Line and even assuming for the sake of argument that the B.S.N. Line paid 31 paise per ton to the employers it cannot be said that the employers are not making any profit out of the whole contract with the B.S.N. Line. The work of unloading the cargo from the carts and trucks is one of the items of the series of operations performed by the contractors and the terms of the contract cannot be considered piecemeal while determining the profit and loss to the contractors.

13. The learned Counsel on behalf of the employers has argued that the Labour Appellate Tribunal had taken into consideration the rates and had not increased the rate to be paid to the workmen and has invited my attention to para 214 of the L.A.T. award. It will appear from the observations of their Lordships of the Labour Appellate Tribunal that the employers were formerly getting 25 paise per ton from the B.S.N. Line. It has been observed at paragraph 214 of the L.A.T. award as follows:—

"In the circumstances of the present case where the company gets from its principal 4 annas per ton and pays 3½ annas per ton and a monthly retention allowance of Rs. 15 we are not inclined to interfere either with the system or rate of payment. The existing piece-rate and retention allowance shall stand."

This shows that the company was getting 25 paise per ton from the B.S.N. Line for the unloading work. It is also clear from the affidavit of Shri Bhat that the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. paid to the company 33 paise per ton for unloading cargo from the carts. It has also come in evidence that the company has been getting the increased rate of 33 paise from 3rd March 1956. It is significant to remember that the L.A.T. award came into operation from 2nd March 1956 and this shows that the B.S.N. Line started paying the employers the increased rate of 33 paise per ton from the next day. This also shows that there is a provision in the agreement between the contractors and their principals and the rates agreed upon are revisable from time to time and the mere fact, that the company is getting a particular rate for this item of work in view of the changed circumstances will not come in the way of the demands made by the workmen.

14. I have already observed that the company is paying its cart unloaders 22 paise per ton of cargo unloaded by them and it appears that the cart unloaders are getting the same even since before the L.A.T. award. Shri Bhat the witness on behalf of the employers joined their service in the year 1956. He has stated that the cart unloaders are being paid the piece-rate of 22 paise per ton since before he joined the company. It appears that the company had entered into an agreement with the Transport and Dock Workers' Union regarding the wages of the unloaders in the year 1952 and since about that time the same rate is being paid to the workmen without any increase and there is much substance in the grievance made by the workmen. It appears from the record that the wages of the other categories of workers in the employ of the company were revised in between. They were also given other service conditions. However, the category of unloaders has been excluded every time.

15. I have already quoted the observations of their Lordships of the L.A.T. by which there was no change in the system or the rates of wages paid to the unloaders. Shri Bhat has in his evidence compared the condition of these workers with others and has stated:—

"There is also clerical staff including supervisors in all about 21. We engage about six monthly stevedore gangs. The business of the company consists of labour contractors, stevedoring agents, clearing agents, travel agents etc. Almost all the sections of our workmen

are given provident fund, gratuity, privilege leave, dearness allowance and annual paid holidays. The unloaders section is the only section that is not given the benefits of the service conditions. All the dock employees are getting the advantage of the service conditions and not the unloaders staff. Those unloaders who were working with us before 1963 are still in the company's employment and are working as shore workers. Some of them are promoted in the year 1966. I do not know since what year the piece-rate of 22 paise was being paid to the workers. It was existing before I joined the company."

From this evidence it is clear that the workmen of the unloading section of the company has not received the attention of the employers and there is every justification for them to feel exploited and hence the union has in the demand dated 18th May 1964 made a grievance to the company that it was high time that a drastic change was made in their wage rate as well as their service conditions so as to compensate for the suffering they had to undergo for these years. It is also quite natural that they should demand the same wage as is paid to the B.P.T. workmen who are doing identical work.

16. It has come in evidence that the structure of wages paid to the dock workers such as the shore workers stevedore workers, cranesmen, clerks etc., was revised by the Meher Award in Reference ITCG-4 of 1954 and subsequently in appeals by the Labour Appellate Tribunal in 1956. It was by this award that the piece-rate system of wages to be paid to the dock workers was introduced. I have already observed that in the dispute Ref. No. 4 of 1954 all the employers viz., the Bombay Port Trust, the Bombay Dock Labour Board and about 20 labour contractors were parties on the one hand and their workmen on the other. In this award the learned Adjudicator treated the employees of the Labour Contractors and of the Bombay Port Trust and the Bombay Dock Labour Board on the same lines and used the same yardstick regarding output as well as wages. Moreover when workers are doing identical work at the same place there is no reason why they should be treated differently in matters of wages simply because they happen to be under the service of different employers. The workmen of the present company were also treated like the employees of the Bombay Port Trust and were given the same rates of wages. In para 101 of the award of Shri Meher it has been observed:—

"In the course of the hearing both the Union and the firm (Messrs. Kanji Jadhavi & Co.) stated that if piece-rates are sanctioned by this Tribunal for the Port Trust shore workers those rates may be made applicable to the daily shore workers of the firm. It was further stated that the firm had no objection to maintain gangs of the strength maintained by the Port Trust and that the working hours on week days and Sundays and holidays and overtime rates should also be the same as those of Port Trust shore workers. I direct that with effect from the date on which the piece-rates for the corresponding category of shore labourers employed by the Port Trust comes into force the shore workers employed by Messrs. Kanji Jadhavi & Co., shall be paid at rates (including premium in respect of output in excess of datum line) sanctioned in this award for corresponding categories of port trust shore workers."

Thus no difference was made between the employees of the company and of the B.P.T. The payment of wages as per the piece-rate system which was introduced and made applicable to the shore workers and other employees of the Bombay Port Trust was also made applicable to the employees of Messrs. Kanji Jadhavi & Co. by the same award.

17. The piece-rate system introduced by the award is of a peculiar nature. It will appear from the award that for calculating wages the learned Adjudicator has fixed a datum for eight hours' shift. When the output of a gang exceeds the relevant datum line in any shift the gang is entitled to payment at higher piece-rate in respect of every type of cargo in excess of the datum line while the workmen were paid time rate wages upto the output equal to the datum line and thus the scheme of payment of wages both according to time rates and after a particular limit of output according to the result is known from that time as the piece-rate scheme applicable to the dock workers.

18. It is not in dispute that both in the Meher Award and in the L.A.T. award the cart and wagon unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust were excluded from the piece-rate scheme and they were paid according to time rate. However, after the L.A.T. award there were various representations on behalf of the excluded categories of workers and as a result a Committee was appointed and a piece rate



scheme which is known as the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee is made applicable to them and they are now being paid under that scheme. The workmen who are parties to the present reference have made a demand that there should be a drastic change in their wage system and the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee and presently in force in respect of the cart and wagon unloaders should be made applicable to them.

19. The employers have after the commencement of the evidence in the proceedings raised a technical objection and have filed an additional written statement. They have contended that the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee as stated in demand No. 1 means only the piece-rates as mentioned in para 18 of the Committee's Report and the demand referred to this Tribunal did not include the demand of the total wage system including the time rate and piece-rates paid to the cart and wagon unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust and the Tribunal cannot go beyond the scope of the demand. It has been further contended that the cart and wagon unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust are time-rated plus piece-rated. The piece-rates to them is a premium for higher tonnage handled by them and in view of the basic difference between the system of payment by the H.P.T. and the company to their cart unloaders the piece-rate scheme of Jeejeebhoy Committee is incapable of being made applicable to the cart unloaders of the company.

20. I have already observed that as some of the categories of the employees of the Bombay Port Trust were excluded from the piece-rate scheme introduced by the L.A.T. award there were representations and the Government of India, Ministry of Transport and Communications had constituted a Committee to examine the feasibility of evolving a system of payment by results to these categories of employees. This Committee is known as the Jeejeebhoy Committee and in para 18 of the Report the Committee has mentioned—

“Cart and Wagon Unloaders—

The cart and wagon unloader of the Bombay Port Trust shall receive if his output exceeds 7 tons in a shift, a premium at the following rates:—

- (a) Between 7 tons and upto 13 tons for every ton or part thereof a premium of 65 nP. per ton.
- (b) Beyond 13 tons for every ton or part thereof his premium shall be at the rate of 75 nP. per ton.”

It is true that nothing has been stated in this paragraph about the payment to the cart and wagon unloaders for their output upto 7 tons in a shift. However it would not mean that the payment of the wages for the output upto the datum of 6 tons is not a part of the piece-rate system of the Jeejeebhoy Committee.

21. It is significant to remember that in the Resolution under which this Committee was appointed it has been specifically stated that the Committee was constituted (a) to examine the feasibility of extending the system of payment by results to the categories of tally clerks, shed staff, stackers, mobile crane drivers and wagon loaders and unloaders employed in the Port Trusts of Bombay and Madras and (b) to devise suitable schemes for payment by results to the categories in respect of which such payment is considered feasible.

22. On examining the feasibility of the extension of the system of payment by results to the various categories the Committee thought that the case of the cart and wagon unloaders was a fit case for extension of the scheme and they included them in that list. I have already discussed the piece-rate scheme which was introduced by the Labour Appellate Tribunal's award according to which workers are paid daily wages upto a certain level of output exceeding which they are paid a premium for the higher output. More or less the same system has been accepted by the Committee. In paragraph 9 of the Report they observed—

“The Committee has arrived at the conclusion that in terms of the Reference the following categories of dock workers of Bombay and Madras Ports, having regard to their functions as being in some way associated with the handling of cargo at the respective Ports, or as lying within the cycle of operations, or as working as Tally Clerks who have to be quick and accurate in checking output and noting details of work on which payment to the workers is based, are eligible for induction into the general concept of the existing scheme of piece-rate by being geared to it in some appropriate manner.”

This clearly shows that the two parts of the payment scheme—the first being the daily wage upto a certain level and the second premium over the higher output—both constitute the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee

and brought in force. In fact both the parts are interdependent on each other and they cannot be separated and there is no substance in the employer's contention that the piece-rate scheme prepared by Shri Jeejeebhoy referred to this Tribunal did not include the first part of the payment viz., the daily wage.

23. The employers have raised this contention by their subsequent statement of claim. If however the earlier written statements of the parties are seen it is clear that both the parties clearly understood that the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee and referred to in demand No. 1 meant the wage structure in force regarding payment to the port and dock cart unloaders. I have already observed that by their demand dated 16th May, 1964 the Union had requested the company to effect a drastic change in the wage rates as well as service conditions of the cart unloaders to compensate them for the sufferings they had undergone for all these years. The company had in their reply dated 19th June, 1964 also taken the demand to mean the change of system of wages and to increase the payment. In this letter they have observed—

"The wages of cart unloaders employed by each company have been the subject matter of an industrial dispute which has been settled by Shri M. R. Mehar in Reference No. 4 of 1954 as modified by the Labour Appellate Tribunal."

This shows that even according to the company the demand in the reference about the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee in force meant that the wage system applicable to the cart unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust should be made applicable to the workmen.

24. I have already discussed the contentions of the employers about the existence of the prior award and the alleged financial inability of the company to meet the demands of the cart and wagon unloaders. It has come in evidence that the Bombay Port Trust and the present employers are the only two agencies that carry on loading and unloading business in Bombay Port and Dock. The employers have been given special berths at the Princes Docks and the sheds and the Bombay Port Trust Works at the remaining sheds. The shore workers including the cart and wagon unloaders employed by these two employers carry on identical work in the same compound and there is no reason why there should be difference in the wages paid to the two groups.

25. The company had fixed the rate of 22 paise per ton for the unloading work to be carried out by the workmen somewhere in the year 1952 and there has been no increase in this rate of payment. I have already discussed the circumstances justifying the workmen to make the demand and I am satisfied that the demand to make the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee applicable to cart and wagon unloaders of the Bombay Port and which is presently in force should be made applicable to them.

26. The cart and wagon unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust were being paid time rate wages before the application of the Jeejeebhoy Committee's Report. As a result of the Report of the Committee they are paid the daily wages upto 7 tons and thereafter a premium. The report of the Jeejeebhoy Committee came into force on 1st October, 1962 and before the introduction of the scheme the cart unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust were getting Rs. 5.72 as daily rate of wages plus Rs. 1.62 paise as dearness allowance. The authorised wage scale of the cart unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust was Rs. 117-3-132 and before the Report of the Committee the Bombay Port Trust was paying to the cart and wagon unloaders the basic wage scale plus other allowances and they were getting the following wages :—

Pav.	Monthly		Total (1+2+3)	Daily rate of wages		D. A.
	C.C.A.	H.R.A.				
Rs.	Rs. Ps.	Rs. Ps.	Rs. Ps.	Rs. Ps.		Rs. Ps.
117	11.70	20.00	148.70	5.72	+	1.60
120	12.00	20.00	152.00	5.84	+	1.60
123	12.30	20.00	155.30	5.98	+	1.60
126	12.50	20.00	158.50	6.09	+	1.60
129	12.50	20.00	161.50	6.21	+	1.60
132	12.50	20.00	164.50	6.33	+	1.60

In addition to the wages on the scales indicated above the cart unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust started earning premium in accordance with the formula laid down by the Piece-Rate Committee and the Union has contended that before the Report of the Committee the cart and wagon loaders of the Bombay Port Trust were getting a daily rate of Rs. 7.33 in addition to the premium. It is also clear that besides basic pay plus city compensatory allowance and house rent allowance amounting to Rs. 5.72 they are presently getting dearness allowance of Rs. 3.23 plus interim relief of 45 paise thus totalling Rs. 9.40 per day. As compared to this payment the monthly earnings of the cart unloaders of the company at the rate of 22 paise per ton comes to Rs. 125 including overtime and extra shift work which is too low and they deserve to be paid the same wages as the cart unloaders of the Port Trust. The employers have contended that the cart unloaders are getting Rs. 180 per month and have filed a schedule regarding the payment to the 10 unloaders for the months January 1967 to October 1967 which shows that Rs. 181.40 paise is the maximum amount paid to the worker and Rs. 152.82 is the minimum. However, it is clear from the evidence of Shri Bhat that these figures include not only the dearness allowance, the additional dearness allowance and the interim relief but it also includes the overtime work and the extra shift work and it shall have to be held that the cart and wagon unloaders of the company are getting comparatively meagre wages for the work done by them.

27. It is significant to remember that the work of the cart unloaders is very heavy and it is difficult to get workers of this category easily. It has been observed in para 92 of the Meher Award as follows:—

"But there is a case for increasing their time rate. The work of cart and wagon unloaders appears to require heavy manual work. It has been pointed out in the Port Trust's written statement at paragraph 78 that in a recent selection for 17 posts of cart and wagon unloaders 234 existing morpias and baroots and 419 category A mazdoors refused to accept the posts and the posts were filled up from lower categories. I award an increase in the basic pay of 5 annas to the cart and wagon unloaders with effect from the date on which this award becomes enforceable."

This will show that though the work of the cart and wagon unloaders is unskilled it requires great strain and exertion and their case cannot be neglected.

28. The cart unloaders of the company are doing the same work and they shall have to be treated on a par with the unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust. It has been observed in para 206 of the L.A.T. award—

"We deal next with the employees of the contractors and begin with Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co., who as labour contractors to the Scindia Steam Navigation Co. Ltd., and the Bombay Steam Navigation Co. Ltd., function as special berths in the Princes Docks and carry on the shore work of loading and unloading cargo similar to that done by the Bombay Port Trust with its shore labour\*\*. The cart unloaders have identically the same work as the cart and wagon unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust. For unloading they have to carry the cargo on the head. Messrs. Kanji Jadhavji & Co. also function as clearing agents for companies including the Government in respect of cement, sugar and foodgrains\*\*"

I have already quoted the observations from the Meher Award which also shows that the shore workers and other employees of the company doing loading and unloading work in the docks are treated on par with the workers of the Bombay Port Trust and there is no reason why the unloaders who are also included in the shore workers should not be paid the same wages as the Bombay Port Trust cart and wagon unloaders and hence I accept demand No. 1 and direct that the cart unloaders of the company also shall be paid the basic wage of Rs. 5.72 together with other allowances and the premium. That is the daily wage and allowances upto the output of 7 tons per shift and thereafter in addition the premium as provided by the recommendations of the Jeejeebhoy Committee will apply.

29. Demand No. 2.—As regards the second demand the workmen have contended that all other service conditions such as provident fund, gratuity, privilege leave, dearness allowance and annual paid holidays should be made applicable to them with immediate effect. The Union in its statement of claim has alleged that this category of workers—that is the unloaders—have been denied by the company for all the years the benefits like provident fund gratuity etc., which have been made applicable to almost all employees even including the sweeping

gangs while only the cart unloaders have been excluded. They have submitted that improvements have been effected in respect of the service conditions of other employees of the company. But there is also a dispute pending between the company and the employees for further improvements in service conditions like provident fund, gratuity etc., and with a view to compensate the unloaders at least partially they should be given the service conditions which would be given to the other workers by the award in Reference No. CGIT 13 of 1965 with retrospective effect.

30. It is not in dispute that the unloaders have not been given the benefit of the service conditions of provident fund and gratuity etc. The company started giving them a small dearness allowance in 1964 and there is much substance in the Union's contention that the cart unloaders of the company are being discriminated. The employers have not also seriously challenged this demand of the workers regarding the service conditions but have contended that Reference No. CGIT 13 of 1965 was made by the Central Government in the Gazette of India by the order dated 30th January, 1965 while the demand of the unloaders referred to this Tribunal has been raised by the Union vide their letter dated 16th May, 1964 and had asked for the service conditions applicable to the shore gangs. At that time the service conditions prevalent for the shore gangs were quite different and the workmen by their written statement cannot demand the service conditions as may be awarded in Reference No. CGIT 13 of 1965.

31. I do not find any validity in the technical contention and the workmen cannot be deprived of their claims to better service conditions merely because in their letter of demand they referred to the service conditions applicable to the shore gangs then. After that demand there were conciliation proceedings and the matter has been referred to this Tribunal and the present reference is whether the workmen were justified in making the demands and if yes to what relief they are entitled. The demands made by the workmen in industrial disputes cannot be treated as plaints in civil suits which are based upon legal rights. Demands of workers for higher wages or service conditions are generally based upon change of circumstances and are usually backed up by a sort of an appeal and a threat of strike. Tribunal have to consider all the circumstances and determine the justifiability. In this view of the matter technicality cannot be stretched too far. If during the proceedings there is a change of circumstances the Tribunal will not be precluded from taking them into consideration while granting relief and the question is whether the unloaders also should be granted the same service conditions as are made applicable to the other workers of the company.

32. I have already observed that the company was a party to the Meher Award in Reference ITCG 4 of 1954. At that time also there was a question about the service benefits and conditions such as provident fund, gratuity etc., to be given to the workmen of the company. I have already quoted the observations of the learned Adjudicator in paragraph 101 of his award published in the Gazette of India Part II section 3(ii) dated 13th June, 1955 which shows that the company had no objection to start a provident fund with a contribution by it. But the learned Adjudicator observed that he had no powers to give directions on that subject as it was not within the scope of his reference. As these service conditions have been made applicable to all the dock workers and the employees of the company it is in the fitness of things that they should also be made applicable to the cart unloaders.

33. *Provident Fund and Gratuity.*—In Reference No. CGIT 13 of 1965 the Union had demanded improvements in the provident fund and gratuity. Under the provident fund scheme applicable to the shore workers of the companies both the employers and the employees were to contribute at the rate of 6½ per cent of their monthly earnings of the basic wage, dearness allowance, additional dearness allowance and the Union had demanded a revision of this scheme by increasing the contribution. They also asked for gratuity at the rate of one month's total wages for each year of service and the adoption of the leave rules as well as the rules regarding provident fund and gratuity applicable to the Bombay Dock Labour Board. In Reference No. CGIT 13 of 1965 both these demands were rejected by the Tribunal on the ground that the Trustees of the Provident Fund and Gratuity were not impleaded as parties to the proceedings. The employers had in this reference also first raised this contention by an affidavit opposing the demands on the ground. However, at the time of hearing they have conceded that the Trustees are not necessary parties. It is also clear that the Trustees merely manage the payment of the provident fund and gratuity. It is the company that makes provision for the necessary funds. It is the company that intimates to the Trust the names of the employees who have been made

members of the provident fund and who are entitled to gratuity and the employers have rightly given up the contention. I have already quoted the evidence of Shri Bhat the Supervisor of the company stating that almost all sections of the workmen of the company are given provident fund, gratuity, privilege leave, dearness allowance, annual paid holidays and that the unloaders were the only section that was not given the benefits of these conditions and there is no reason why they should be discriminated and in my opinion the cart unloaders should also be awarded all these service conditions from the employers.

34. I have already observed that the other workers of the company had demanded improvement in the provident fund and gratuity scheme in Reference No. CGIT 13 of 1965. They had prayed for increase in the contribution to  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent. The Union has now produced a letter dated 21st December, 1967 sent by the Secretary of the Bombay Dock Labour Board which shows that the representative of the All India Port and Dock Workers' Federation and the Ministries of Transport and Labour of the Central Government have agreed upon the basis of the contribution to the provident fund and in respect of the rate of gratuity. It appears that according to this agreement the workers will be entitled to contribution to the provident fund at the rate of 8 per cent of their pay i.e. the enlarged term 'pay' and even though the Union had in Reference No. CGIT 13 of 1965 demanded a contribution at the rate of  $8\frac{1}{2}$  per cent of the total wages and an equal amount to be contributed by the employers in view of the agreement they shall have to modify the demand.

35. Learned Counsel on behalf of the employers has argued that as these demands about provident fund and gratuity have been rejected in Reference No. 13 of 1965 they cannot be claimed in these proceedings. I have already discussed this technical objection and rejected the same. In the reference itself we have to decide as to what relief the workmen are entitled to. It is not in dispute that the demand made on behalf of the shore gang workers for revising the scheme of provident fund is based on more or less the provident fund scheme followed by the employers in the docks i.e. the Bombay Port Trust, the Bombay Dock Labour Board, the stevedore employers and other contractors. It is also clear that the company has a gratuity scheme for its stevedore section employees as well as the dock staff which is in line with the Bombay Dock Labour Board and other stevedore employers. The gratuity scheme applicable to the stevedore section is as per agreement reached between the Government of India and the All India Port and Dock Workers' Federation and in my opinion the cart and wagon unloaders of the company will also be entitled to the benefits of provident fund and gratuity on the same lines adopted by the Bombay Dock Labour Board and other employers. It is hereby held that the cart and wagon unloaders employed by the company are entitled to a provident fund scheme; the workmen should contribute 8 per cent of the total wages to the provident fund and the company should contribute an equal amount. The workers would be entitled to the company's contribution after five years' service.

36. Regarding gratuity it is hereby held that the cart and wagon unloaders of the company shall be entitled to payment of gratuity at the rate of 15 days per year of service and for determining the exact amount payable the earnings of the workers for a period of six working months immediately prior to the claim and entitlement of the gratuity shall be taken and an average of 15 days pay shall be determined. All past service shall be reckoned and considered for gratuity. The worker will be entitled to gratuity after five years of completed service. A year shall mean full year. In case a year is not complete the service of less than six months shall be dropped but of six months and above shall be considered as one full year. For the purposes of provident fund and gratuity the term pay will mean the enlarged term pay as defined in the letter dated 21st December 1967.

37. *Dearness allowance, privilege leave and holidays.*—The union has contended that the company had not paid any dearness allowance to the workers before 1st October 1964. It appears that the company started paying a small amount of dearness allowance to the unloaders from 1st October, 1964. At present they are in all paying only Rs. 1.90 which consists of dearness allowance and interim relief. The workmen have alleged that the Bombay Port Trust's cart unloaders were getting dearness allowance of Rs. 3.20 in addition to the interim relief of 45 paise per shift and thus a gang worker is paid a total allowance of Rs. 3.68 and it has been contended that the service conditions, regarding dearness allowance, privilege leave and holidays applicable to the shore gang workers of the company should be made applicable to the cart unloaders. It has been further contended that the other workers were getting privilege leave at the rate of 30 days in the year with a right to accumulate it upto 90 days. They were also getting 13 days holidays with pay in a year and it is claimed that the cart unloaders should be granted the same facilities.

38. It is not in dispute that the company had not paid any dearness allowance to their cart unloaders before 1st October 1964 and they were paying only the wages calculated as per the piece-rate scheme of 22 paise per ton with a retention allowance and considering the rise in prices and changes of circumstances it shall have to be held that the cart unloaders are entitled to dearness allowance on the same basis as the other workers. The question about the revision of the service conditions of the other workers of the company was before the Central Government Industrial Tribunal, Bombay in Ref. No. CGIT-13 of 1965 and as the cart unloaders are also shore gang workers their demand that the same service conditions regarding dearness allowance, privilege leave and holidays which have been granted in the award in Ref. No. CGIT-13 of 1965 should be given to them is justified. I have already discussed the circumstances under which the cart unloaders are working and the remuneration they are getting from the beginning. Cost of living has affected all dock workers alike and there is no justification in denying these service benefits to the cart unloaders. By this award I direct that the conditions of service regarding dearness allowance, privilege leave and paid holidays granted by the award in CGIT-13 of 1965 will be applicable to the cart and wagon unloaders in this reference.

(i) It is directed that all the unloaders covered by this reference who were in the service of the company on the date of the demand i.e. 16th May 1964 will get all the increases in the dearness allowance granted by Government in the various notifications from the dates and at the rates mentioned in them.

(ii) Considering the leave provisions granted by the company to the other categories of employees, it is hereby declared that the cart and wagon unloaders of the company are entitled to paid privilege leave at the rate of 30 days in a year with a right to accumulate the same upto 90 days. I award accordingly.

(iii) It is not in dispute that the other shore gang workers in the employ of the company are given annual paid holidays on the same lines as are given by the Bombay Port Trust and the Bombay Dock Labour Board. In view of this practice the cart unloaders of the company are also entitled to get the same service conditions of paid holidays and it is hereby directed that the cart and wagon unloaders of the company should be granted annual holidays with wages as per the shore gang workers employed by the company.

39. *Retrospective effect.*—The representative of the union has argued that the workmen unloaders of the company should be granted these demands regarding the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee and the benefits of service conditions with retrospective effect from 1st October 1962. I have held that the unloaders of the company are justified in making the demand of the piece-rate scheme prepared by the Jeejeebhoy Committee and presently in force and the same should be made applicable to them. The union first made the demand on the company on 16th May 1964 and the question is whether the workers are entitled to claim it retrospectively. I have already observed that in Ref. No. ITCG-4 of 1954 and the appellate award made by the Labour Appellate Tribunal was subsisting between the present employers and the cart unloaders and it was in force when the demand was made. The company had contended that because of the subsisting award the reference was bad in law. I have negated this contention. However, the circumstance that there was an award between the parties governing the wages has to be taken into account while granting the relief and I do not think that though the reference is valid the workmen would be justified to claim the enhanced rate of wages without terminating the award. The union has under section 19(6) of the Industrial Disputes Act terminated this award by their letter dated 2nd February 1965 and in my opinion the workmen in this case will be entitled to the benefit of this demand only from that date and the system of payment of wages to the cart unloaders of the Bombay Port Trust which is in force and which is known as the piece-rate scheme prepared by Shri Jeejeebhoy will be made applicable to the present workmen from 2nd February 1965. From that day the company's unloaders will be deemed to be appointed in the authorised scale of Rs. 117-3-132 as his counterpart unloader working in the Bombay Port Trust and from that day he will get the city compensatory and house rent allowances and his daily rate of wages will be Rs. 5.72. Besides this amount he will be entitled to claim dearness allowance and piece-rate scheme premium.

40. The union has also claimed retrospective effect about the benefits of the service conditions to be applied to the workers. The employers have not raised any contention about the validity of the reference on the ground of the previous award regarding these demands and in my opinion the workmen will be entitled to get the service benefits regarding provident fund, gratuity and dearness allowance from the date of the demand i.e. from 16th May 1964 and I direct accordingly.

41. The payments to which the workers are entitled under this award should be made within one month from the date this award becomes enforceable.

42. The learned Counsel for the company has by his subsequent written statement contended that in view of the prospective recommendations of the Wage Board for the Port and Dock workers at major ports this Tribunal should give necessary directions so that the company should not be doubly saddled with the burden. However, no material has been placed before me as to what amounts have been paid by the company as per the interim recommendations made by the Board. Regarding the additional payment if any that will be required to be made in view of the premium under the Jeejeebhoy scheme for the output exceeding seven tons the question of directions does not arise as it will be the part of the wage itself. The final recommendations also are not out and it will be premature to give any directions.

43. As regards costs, considering the various written statements I think this is a fit case wherein costs of Rs. 250/- should be awarded in favour of the union. The employers will pay the costs within a month from the date this award becomes enforceable.

(Sd.) A. T. ZAMBRE,

Presiding Officer.

Central Government Industrial Tribunal,  
Bombay.

[No. 28/78/64-LRIV.]

*New Delhi, the 23rd January 1968*

**S.O. 454.**—The following draft of rules further to amend the Industrial Disputes (Central) Rules, 1967, which the Central Government proposes to make, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 38 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), is published, as required by sub-section (1) of the said section, for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that any objections or suggestions received from any person with respect of the said draft on or before the 15th March, 1968, will be considered by the Central Government.

*Draft rules*

1. These rules may be called the Industrial Disputes (Central) Amendment Rules, 1968.

2. In rule 61 of the Industrial Dispute (Central) Rules, 1957,—

- (1) in sub-rule (1) of the said rule, for the figures, abbreviation and word, "30th September", the figures, abbreviation and word, "30th April" shall be substituted;
- (2) in sub-rule (2) of the said rule, after the words "protected workmen" occurring at the end of the sub-rule, the words "for the period of twelve months from the date of such communication" shall be inserted.

[No. F. 2/1/67-LRI.]

O. P. TALWAR, Under Secy.

(Department of Labour & Employmen')

*New Delhi, the 23rd January 1968*

**S.O. 455.**—The following draft of a scheme further to amend the Calcutta Unregistered Dock workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, which the Central Government proposes to make in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), is published as required by the said sub-section for the information of all persons likely to be affected thereby; and notice is hereby given that the said draft will be taken into consideration on or after the 15th February, 1968.

Any objections or suggestions which may be received from any person with respect to the said draft before the date so specified will be taken into consideration by the Central Government.

## DRAFT SCHEME

*Amendment Scheme*

1. (1) This Scheme may be called the Calcutta Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1968.
  - (2) It shall come into force on the date of its publication in the Official Gazette.
  2. In the Calcutta Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1957, after clause 8, the following clause shall be inserted, namely:—
    - 8 A. *Restriction on Listing of Employers.*—Notwithstanding anything contained in clause 8, the following classes of persons shall not be eligible for being listed as employers under this Scheme, namely:—
      - (a) persons who are not citizens of India;
      - (b) firms, one or more partners of which is, or are, not citizen or citizens of India; and
      - (c) companies, the majority of the shareholders whereof are not citizens of India.
    - (2) Notwithstanding anything contained in this Scheme, if any of the persons referred to in sub-clause (1) has been listed under this Scheme before the commencement of the Calcutta Unregistered Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Amendment Scheme, 1968, his name shall be removed from the list of employers after the expiry of three months from such commencement unless, during such period, he obtains permission in writing from the competent civil authority appointed under clause (2) of paragraph 2 of the Foreigners Order, 1948 for his name being retained in such list and produces the same to the Board:
- Provided that before refusing any such permission, the civil authority shall give a reasonable opportunity to the employer of being heard".

[No. 529/28/63-Fac. II.]

K. D. HAJELA, Under Secy.

## (Department of Rehabilitation)

## (Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

## ORDER

*New Delhi, the 17th January 1968*

S.O. 456.—In pursuance of Rule 11-D(D)(A) of the Evacuee Interest (Separation) Rules, 1951, the Central Government hereby makes the following order to amend the order published with the notification of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Works, Housing and Rehabilitation (Department of Rehabilitation) No. S.O. 531 dated 6th February 1964, namely:—

In the said order,

For the words and figures "31st December, 1967" the words and figures "31st March, 1968" shall be substituted.

[No. 5(24)/59-Prop. II-Comp. &amp; Prop.]

A. G. VASWANI,

Settlement Commissioner & *Ex-Officio* Under Secy

## MINISTRY OF RAILWAYS

## (Railway Board)

*New Delhi, the 25th January 1968*

S.O. 457.—In pursuance of clause (c) of section 2 of the Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Act, 1956 (69 of 1956), the Central Government hereby declares the place specified in the Schedule hereto annexed to be a "notified place" for the purposes of the said Act.



2. This notification shall come into force with effect from the 1st February, 1968.

## SCHEDULE

(1) Rishikesh.

[No. F. (X) I-67/TX-19/5-1.]

**S.O. 458.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 3 of the Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Act, 1956 (69 of 1956), and in supersession of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Railways (Railway Board) No. F(X) II-61/TX-19/12, dated the 2nd April, 1962, the Central Government hereby :—

(a) fixes the rates mentioned in columns III and IV of the Schedule annexed hereto as the rates at which terminal tax shall be levied in respect of every railway ticket on all passengers carried by railway from or to the notified places specified in column I of the said Schedule, and

(b) directs that the aforesaid terminal tax shall be leviable with effect from the 1st February, 1968.

2. This notification shall come into force on the 1st February, 1968

## THE SCHEDULE

## Rates of terminal tax.

I	II	III				IV	
Sl. No.	Names of notified places.	Class of accommodation.	Single tickets.				Monthly tickets.
			Adult		Child between 3 and 12 years of age.		
			Short distance passengers	Long distance passengers	Short distance passengers	Long distance passengers	
			16 miles— 150 miles (25 kms.— 242 kms.) in respect of Serial Nos. 1 to 4 and 12½ miles— 150 miles (21 kms.— 242 kms.) in respect of Serial No. 5	Beyond 150 miles (242 kms.)	16 miles— 150 miles (25 kms.— 242 kms.) in respect of Serial Nos. 1 to 4 and 12½ miles— 150 miles (21 kms.— 242 kms.) in respect of Serial No. 5	Beyond 150 miles (242 kms.)	
			Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.	Rs. nP.
1	Hardwar	Air Conditioned or 1st class.	1.30	1.50	0.65	0.75	45.00
2	Jawalapur						
3	Near Tunnel	II class	0.90	1.00	0.45	0.50	22.50
4	Bhimgoda Tank	III class	0.35	0.50	0.18	0.25	7.50
5	Rishikesh						

NOTE: The Terminal Tax on a return ticket shall be double the rates fixed herein.

[No. F. (X) I-67/TX-19/5-3.]

**S.O. 450.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Terminal Tax on Railway Passengers Act, 1956 (60 of 1956), the Central Government hereby directs that no terminal tax shall be levied on passengers travelling by railway from or to the notified place mentioned in the Schedule hereto annexed, to or from any railway station situated within a radius of 20 kilometres (12½ miles) from such notified place.

2. This notification shall have effect on and from the 1st February, 1968.

#### SCHEDULE

(1) Rishikesh.

[No. F. (X) I-67/TX-19,5-3.]

C. S. PARAMESWARAM, Secy.

### CENTRAL BOARD OF DIRECT TAXES

#### INCOME-TAX

New Delhi, the 22nd January 1968

**S.O. 460.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby makes the following addition to the Schedule annexed to its Notification No. 1 (F. No. 53/233/63-IT), dated the 18th May, 1964:

After S. No. 43 in the said Schedule, the following S. Nos. shall be added:

1	2	3	4	5	6
44.	Defence Services employees under the audit control of the Deputy Controller of Military Accounts, Jamnagar.	Income-tax Officer, Ward-A Jamnagar.	Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax Jamnagar Range, Jamnagar.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax Jamnagar Range, Jamnagar.	Commissioner of Income-tax, Gujarat I, Ahmedabad.
45.	Employees of Protos Engineering Co. Pvt. Ltd., Bombay stationed anywhere in the taxable territories.	10th Income-tax, Officer, Salaries Branch-II, Bombay.	Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, P-Range, Bombay.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, P-Range, Bombay.	Commissioner of Income-tax, Bombay City I, Bombay
46.	Employees of Gammen India P. Ltd., Bombay stationed anywhere in the taxable territories.	2nd Income-tax, Officer, Salaries Branch II, Bombay.	Do.	Do.	Do.
47.	Employees under the audit control of A.G., Rajasthan and Deputy Controller of Military Accounts, Rajasthan.	Income-tax Officers, Salary Circle I, II & III Jaipur.	Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax Jaipur, Range II, Jaipur.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, B-Range, Jaipur.	Commissioner of Income-tax, Rajasthan, Jaipur.

1	2	3	4	5	6
48 (i) Employees of the Southern Railway who are under the audit control of the Divisional Accounts Officers, Madras, Tiruchirapalli and Madurai Divisions.	2nd Income-tax Officer, Salaries Circle I, Madras.	Inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income Tax who has been appointed to perform the functions of an I.A.C. in respect of the I.T.O. referred to in Col. 3.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax who has been invested with powers to hear appeals against the decisions of the I.T.O. referred to in Col. 3.	Commissioner of Income Tax, Madras II, Madras.	
(ii) Employees of the Southern Railway working in the following Accounts Offices:	D	Do.	Do.	Do.	
F.A. and C.A.O.'s Office, Madras,					
Senior Accounts Officers' Office (Traffic) Trichirapalli,					
S.A.O. (W&S) Office, Golden Rock,					
S.A.O.'s Office, Perambur, and					
S.A.O.'s Office (Construction), Madras Egmore.					
(iii) Employees of Integral Coach Factory, Madras who are under the audit control of the F.A. and C.A.O., Integral Coach Factory, Madras.	Do.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
49. Executive and Assistant Grade Staff of Madras Branch of M/s. Rallis India Limited.	1st Income Tax Officer, Salaries Circle II, Madras.	Do.	Do.	Do.	
50. Employees of American Baptist Foreign Mission Society, Madras.	Do.	Do.	Do.	Do.	

1	2	3	4	5	6
51.	Employees of M/s. Caltex (India) Ltd., stationed anywhere in the taxable territories who are paid by the Madras office of the company.	3rd Income Tax Officer, Salaries Circle, II, Madras.	inspecting Assistant Commissioner of Income tax, who has been appointed to perform the functions of an I.A.C. in respect of the I.T.O. referred to in Col. 3.	Appellate Assistant Commissioner of Income-tax, who has been invested with powers to hear appeals against the decisions of the I.T.O. referred to in Col. 3.	Commissioner of income tax, Madras II, Madras.
52.	Covenanted and other employees of the Bombay-Burmah Trading Corporation Ltd., who are paid by the Mudis group office of the company.	Income-tax Officer, Salaries Circle, Coimbatore.	Do.	Do.	Do.

This notification shall take effect from the 12th February, 1968.

[No. 19 (F. No. 55/129/67-IT(A.II) ]

**S.O. 461.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 126 of the Income-tax Act, 1961 (43 of 1961), the Central Board of Direct Taxes hereby delete S. Nos. 2C(i), 2C(ii), 3, 3A, 3C, 3D, 3E, 21I, 21J, 59 and 75 & 79 and the entries thereagainst from the Schedule annexed to its Notification S.R.O. 1214 (No. 44 Income-tax) dated 1st July, 1952.

This notification shall take effect from the 12th February, 1968.

N. K. DUTT, Under Secy.

[No. 18(F. No. 55/129/67-IT(A.II).]

## MINISTRY OF FINANCE

(Department of Revenue and Insurance)

### ORDER

### STAMPS

New Delhi, the 3rd February 1968

**S.O. 462.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of sub-section (1) of section 9 of the Indian Stamp Act, 1899 (2 of 1899), the Central Government hereby remits the stamp duty chargeable under the said Act on the receipts executed by the cultivators under the Uttar Pradesh Paddy Collection (Recovery from Cultivators) Order, 1967.

[No. 4/68-F. No. 1/3/68-Cus.VII/Stamps.]

M. S. SUBRAMANYAM, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT AND COMPANY AFFAIRS****(Department of Industrial Development)****ORDER***New Delhi, the 17th January 1968*

**S.O. 463.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 read with rule 4 of the Central Advisory Council (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints the undermentioned persons, to be members till the 3rd November, 1969, of the Central Advisory Council of Industries established by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Industrial Development and Company Affairs (Department of Industrial Development) No. S.O. 4044, dated the 4th November 1967, and directs that the following amendment shall be made in the said Order, namely :—

In the said Order, after entry No. 21 relating to Shri S. M. Patil, the following entries shall be added, namely :—

- "22. Shri T. S. Narayanaswami, c/o The India Cements Ltd., 175/1, Mount Road, Madras.
23. Shri Sarat Chandra Sinha, Gauhati-3.
24. Shri Satish Chandra, Chairman and Managing Director, The Fertilizer Corporation of India, F-43, South Extension Area, Part I Ring Road, New Delhi-32.
25. Shri Shyamnandan Mishra, M.P., 24, Dr. Rajendra Prasad Road New Delhi-1.
- 26 Shri H. S. Singhania, Chairman, Indian Jute Mills Association, Royal Exchange, 6, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1".

[No. 1(5) Lic Pol./67 ]

R. C SETHI, Under Secy.

## (Department of Industrial Development Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 19th January 1968

S.O. 464.—The Certification Marks Licences, details of which are mentioned in the schedule given hereafter, have lapsed or their renewal deferred :

## THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Licence No. and Date	Licensee's Name and Address	Article/Process and the Relevant IS : No.	S. O. Number and Date of the Gazette Notifying Grant of Licence	Remarks
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
1	CM/L-157 23-12-1959	Shamsher Sterling Corpn. Ltd., Vaswani Mansions Road, Bombay-1.	Rubber insulated cables—IS: 434 (Parts I & II)—1964	S.O. 73 dated 9-1-1960	Deferred after 31-12-1967.
2	CM/L-401 29-3-1962	Ronald Armstrong Causeway, Colaba Causeway, Bombay-5.	Tumbler switches of 5 amperes— IS : 1087-1957 (superseded by IS: 3854-1966)	S.O. 1509 dated 19-5-1962	Deferred after 30-11-1967.
3	CM/L-472 16-11-1962	Bharat Sheet Metal Industries Ltd., 22 Beerpara Lane, Chugudanga, Dum Dum, Calcutta.	Steel drums—IS: 2552-1963	..	Deferred after 30-11-1967.
4	CM/L-482 3-12-1962	Kamani Metals, & Alloys Ltd., Agra Road, Kurla, Bombay-70.	Rolled brass plate, sheet, strip and foil—IS : 410-1959.	S.O. 241 dated 26-1-1963	Deferred after 15-12-1967.
5	CM/L-484 20-12-1962	Vijaya Foundry, T. S. No. 10/1075/3 Pulikaulam Road, Pappaniackenn- palayam, Coimbatore (Madras State).	Horizontal centrifugal pumps for clear, cold, fresh water—IS : 1520- 1960.	S.O. 241 dated 26-1-1963	Deferred after 31-12-1967.
6	CM/L-827 2-11-1964	Jindal Steel Works, Malerkotla (Pb).	Structural steel (standard quality)— IS : 226-1962.	S.O. 79 dated 2-1-1965	These licences were deferred after 15-11-1967 and have now to be treated as lapsed after that date.
7	CM/L-828 2-11-1964	Jindal Steel Works, Malerkotla (Pb).	Structural steel (ordinary quality)— IS : 1977-1962.	S.O. 79 dated 2-1-1965	

8	CM/L-867 28-11-1964	The Standard Jute Co. Ltd., Titaghur, 24 Parganas.	Jute hesian—IS : 2818-1964.	S.O. 79 dated 2-1-1965	Lapsed after 30-11-1967.
9	CM/L-979 21-12-1964	Periyar Metal Products, Industrial Estate, Ettumanoor, Kottayam.	Wrought aluminium utensils, grade SIC—IS : 21-1959.	S.O. 274 dated 23-1-1965	Deferred after 31-12-1967.
10	CM/L-1357 30-11-1966	P.T.C. Sanghvi Co., 110 Shivajingar, Poona-5.	Rollod brass sheets and strips, grade Bs 60—IS : 410-1959	S.O. 3923 dated 24-12-1966	Deferred after 15-12-1967.
11	CM/L-1360 30-11-1966	Ankar Industries, Jessore Road, P.O. Madhyamgram, Distt. 24 Parganas.	BHC dusting powders—IS. 561-1962	S.O. 3923 dated 24-12-1966	Deferred after 30-11-1967.
12	CM/L-1373 27-12-1966	Azad Industries, Jepoo, Mangalore-1.	Biscuits (excluding wafer biscuits)— IS : 1011-1957	S.O. 243 dated 21-1-1967	Deferred after 31-12-1967.

NOTE :—Entries pertaining to licence No. CM/L-1308 of M/s. Inland Electrical Mfg. Co. Pvt. Ltd., Basunagar, appearing at Sl. No. 17 of the schedule published under number S.O. 45 dated 22 December 1967, in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3(ii) dated 6 January 1968, should be treated as cancelled.

[No. MD/33 : 16/C.]

---

*New Delhi, the 23rd January 1968*

---

**S.O. 465.**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 5 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are mentioned in the Schedule given hereafter, have been cancelled.

THE SCHEDULE

---

Serial No.	No. and Title of the Indian Standard Cancelled	No. and Date of Gazette Notification in which Establishment of the Indian Standard was notified
<hr/>		
1	IS: 331—1951 Specification for chrome salt	S.R.O. 658 dated 26 March 1955, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3, dated 26 March, 1955.
2	IS: 535—1955 Specification for benzene, pure, nitration grade	S.R.O. 846 dated 3 April 1956, published in the Gazette of India, Part II, Section 3 dated 14 April 1956.

---

[No. MD/13:7]



**S.O. 466.**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of Regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Regulations, 1955, as subsequently amended, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that one hundred and forty-five licences, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been renewed.

# THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No	Licence No. and date	Period of Validity From	To	Name and Address of the Licensee	Article/Process covered by the licence	Relevant Indian Standard
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	CM/L-21 3-12-1956	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Devidayal Metal Industries, Tulsiram Gupta Mills Estate, Darukhana, Bombay-10.	Wrought aluminium and aluminium alloy sheets, strips and circles.	IS:21-1959 Specification for wrought aluminium and aluminium alloys for utensils—(second revision).
2	CM/L-24 19-12-1956	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Light Metal Works, New Sun Mill's Compound, Delisle Road, Bombay-13.	Wrought aluminium and aluminium alloy utensils.	IS:21-1959 Specification for wrought aluminium and aluminium alloys for utensils—(second revision).
3	CM/L-85 24-4-1958	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Hindustan Timber Industries 41, Chaulpatty Road, Beliaghata, Calcutta-10.	Tea-chest plywood panels.	IS:10-1964 Specification for plywood tea-chests (second revision).
4	CM/L-106 4-11-1958	16-12-67	15-12-68	The Mysore Chemical Manufacturers Ltd., Chikhavawar P.O., Bangalore Distt.	Copper sulphate, technical.	IS:261-1950 Specification for copper sulphate, technical.
5	CM/L-112 26-12-1958	1-1-68	31-12-68	The Kesar Sugar Works Ltd., 45-47, Apollo Street, Fort, Bombay-1.	Hydroquinone, photographic grade	IS-388-1963 Specification for hydroquinone, photographic grade (revised).
6	CM-L/245 28-11-1960	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s Tipco The Industrial Plastics Corporation Ltd., 14, Hamam Street, Fort, Bombay-1.	Phenolic moulding materials Grades 2 & 3.	IS:1300-1966 Specification for phenolic moulding materials <sup>8</sup> (second revision).
7	CM/L-252 26-12-1960	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Tata Fison Industries Ltd., Union Bank Building, Dalal Street, Bombay.	Copper oxychloride water dispersible powder concentrates.	IS:1507-1966 Specification for copper oxychloride water dispersible powder concentrates (first revision).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)		
8	CM/L-358 20-11-1961	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Indian Traders Pvt. Ltd., Industrial Area, Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-15.	Type  TRS (tough rubber sheathed) Braided & compo- unded Weather proof.	Voltage grade  250/440 volts  250/440 & 650/1100V 250/440 & 650/1100V	Conductor      Copper or alumi- nium	(i) IS:434 (Part I)—1964 Specification for rubber in- sulated cables with copper conductors ( <i>revised</i> ). (ii) IS:434 (Part II)—1964 Specification for rubber- insulated cables with alumi- nium conductors ( <i>revised</i> ).
9	CM/L-363 30-11-1961	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s Nielcon Private Ltd., Off Andheri Kurla Road, J. B. Nagar, Near Vazir Glass Works, Bombay-59.	Three-phase induction motors up to 10 HP with class 'A' in- sulation.			IS:325—1961 Specification for three-phase induction motors ( <i>second revision</i> ).
10	CM/L-365 12-12-1961	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Ditz Electricals (India) Ltd., 29 Malkaganj Road, Delhi.	Electrical portable immersion heaters for domestic use (500 watts to 4000 watts capacity). 18-litre square tins.			IS:368-1963 Specification for electric immersion water heaters ( <i>revised</i> ). IS:916-1966 Specification for 18-litre square tins ( <i>revised</i> ). IS:916-1966 Specification for 18-litre square tins ( <i>revised</i> ).
11	CM/L-366 15-12-1961	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Tungabhadra Industries Ltd., Kurnool (Andhra Pradesh).	18-litre square tins.			(i) IS:1845-1961 Specification for common salt for butter and cheese industry. (ii) IS:2035-1961 Specification for free-flowing table salt.
12	CM/L-369 22-12-1961	1-1-68	31-12-68	The D.C.M. Container Works, Najafgarh Road, New Delhi-15.				IS:1567-1960 Specification for metal clad switches (current rating not exceeding 100 amperes).
13	CM/L-462 28-9-1962	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s Sambhar Salts Ltd., Sambhar Lake.	(i) Common salt for butter and cheese industry. (ii) Free-flowing table salt.			
14	CM/L-463 11-10-1962	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Basant Pran & Company, Industrial Estate, Baruipur, having their office at 9, Old Court House Street, Calcutta-1.	Metal clad switches 15 amp 250 volts, with HC type fuse base and carrier.			
15	CM/L-465 30-12-1962	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s E.A.G. Minerals Supply, B/1 Hide Road, Kidderpore, Calcutta-23 having their Head Office at P 22 Swallow Lane, Calcutta-1.	BHC dusting powders.			IS:561-1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders ( <i>second revision</i> ).

16	CM/L-477 29-11-1962	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Shalimar Tar Products (1935) Ltd., P-46, Hide Road Extension, Kidderpore, Calcutta-23 having their office at 6 Lyons Range, Calcutta-1.	Bitumen (plastics) for waterproofing purposes.	IS:1580-1960 Specification for bitumen (plastic) for waterproofing purposes.
17	CM/L-479 29-11-1962	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Shalimar Tar Products (1935) Limited, P-46 Hide Road Extension, Kidderpore, Calcutta-23 having their office at 6 Lyons Range, Calcutta-1.	Preformed fillers for expansion joint in concrete non-extruding and resilient type (bitumen-impregnated fibre).	IS:1838-1961 Specification for preformed fillers for expansion joint in concrete non-extruding and resilient type (bitumen-impregnated fibre).
18	CM/L-483 5-12-1962	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s Laxhi Trading Co., Village Road, Bhandup, Bombay-78 having their office at 2nd Jai Hind Estate, Building No. 2, Bhuteshwar, Bombay-2 and Laxhi Industrial House, Agra Road, Bhandup, Bombay-78 (NB).	Wrought aluminium utensils grade SIC.	IS: 21-1959 Specification for wrought aluminium and aluminium alloy for utensils (second revision).
19	CM/L-486 20-12-1962	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Gautam Electric Motors Pvt. Ltd., 42, Okhla Industrial Estate, New Delhi-20.	Single-phase small AC and universal electric motors of 1 HP with class 'A' insulation.	IS:996-1964 Specification for single-phase small and universal electric motors (revised).
20	CM/L-547 14-6-1963	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s Sheet & Metal Industries, 137-A, Jeypore Road, Dum Dum, Calcutta-28.	Tea-chest metal fittings.	IS:10-1964 Specification for plywood tea-chests (second revision).
21	CM/L-606 29-11-1963	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s Associated Pigments Ltd., 260, Barrackpore Trunk Road, P.O. Sukchar, 24 Parganas, West Bengal, having their office at 14, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Zinc oxide for paints.	IS:35-1950 Specification for zinc oxide for paints.
22	CM/L-759 19-8-1964	1-1-68	31-8-68	M/s Indian Cable & Wire Industries, C32/34 Industrial Estate, Guindy, Madras-32.	<div> <div>Type</div> <div>Voltage</div> <div>Conductor</div> </div> <div> <div>VIR cables for</div> <div>fixed wiring</div> </div> <div> <div>(i) TRS(tough rubber sheathed)</div> <div>250/440 volts</div> </div> <div> <div>(ii) Braided &amp; compounded</div> <div>250/440 &amp; 650/1100 volts</div> </div> <div> <div>Copper only.</div> </div>	IS: 434 (Part I)—1964 Specification for rubber insulated cables with copper conductors (revised).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
*23	CM/L-823 2-II-1964	16-II-67	15-II-68	M/s Swadeshi Industries Ltd., Mills at Panihati, 24 Parganas (West Bengal) having their Regd. Office at 4, Synagogue Street, Calcutta-1.	Structural steel (standard quality) for sections up to 25 mm dia or square and other sections of equivalent area.	IS: 226—1962 Specification for structural steel (standard quality) ( <i>third revision</i> ).
*24	CM/L-824 2-II-1964	16-II-67	15-II-68	M/s Swadeshi Industries Ltd., Mills at Panihati, 24 Parganas (West Bengal) having their Regd. Office at 4, Synagogue Street, Calcutta-1.	Structural steel (ordinary quality) for sections up to 25 mm dia or square and other sections of equivalent area.	IS: 1977-1962 Specification for structural steel (ordinary quality).
25	CM/L-837 23-II-1964	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s) Lucky Acid & Chemical Works, 32/2, Murari Pukur Road, Calcutta-4.	Nitric Acid, technical, pure and AR grades.	IS: 264—1950 Specification for nitric acid.
26	CM/L-839 23-II-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Industrial Research Corporation, 2/70, East Mada Street, Thiruvanniyur, Madras-41.	Dye-based fountain pen ink (blue, green, red and violet).	IS: 1221—1957 Specification for dye-based fountain pen ink (blue, green, violet, black and red).
27	CM/L-841 25-II-1965	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s New Chemi Mineral Mills Pvt. Ltd., Chakravarti Ashok Road, Industrial Estate, Kandivli (East), Bombay having their office at 7-A Dean Lane, Fort, Bombay-1.	BHC water dispersible powder concentrates.	IS: 562-1966 Specification for BHC water dispersible Powder concentrates ( <i>second revision</i> ).
28	CM/L-844 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Barnagore Jute Factory Co. Ltd. 284, Maharaja Nandakumar Road, Alambazar, Calcutta-35 having their Registered Office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
29	CM/L-845 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Barnagore Jute Factory Co. Ltd., 284 Maharaja Nandakumar road, Alambazar, Calcutta-35 having their Registered office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.

30	CM/L-846 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Kanknarrah Co. Ltd., 1 Clark, Ghat Road, Bhatpara, 24 parganas having their Office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
31	CM/L-847 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Kanknarrah Co. Ltd., 1, Clark Ghat Road, Bhatpara, 24 Par- ganas having their Office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
32	CM/L-848 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Kamarhatty Co. Ltd., 907, Graham Road, Kamarhatty, 24 Parganas having their Office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
33	CM/L-849 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Kamarhatty Co. Ltd., 907, Graham Road, Kamarhatty, 24 Parganas having their Office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2565-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
34	CM/L-850 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Howrah Mills Co. Ltd., 493/C/ A, G.T. Road, South Howrah having their Office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	IS: 2818-1964* Specification for Indian hessian.

\*The period of validity of these licences were shown as '1-12-1967 to 30-11-1968' in the notification published under number S.O. 4569 in the Gazette of India, Part II—Section 3, Sub-section(ii) dated 23 December, 1967.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
35	CM/L-851 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Howrah Mills Co., Ltd., 493/C/A G.T. Road, South Howrah having their Office at 4, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
36	CM/L-852 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Budge Budge Jute Mills Co. Ltd., 57, Maulana Azad Road, Budge Budge, Calcutta having their Office at 8, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	
37	CM/L-853 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Budge Budge Jute Mills Co. Ltd., 57, Maulana Azad Road, Budge Budge, Calcutta having their Office at 8, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill Jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
38	CM/L-854 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Delta Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Manikpore, Sankrail, Howrah having their Office at 8, Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	
39	CM/L-855 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Delta Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Manikpore Sankrail, Howrah having their Office at 8 Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.

40	CM/L-856 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Cheviot Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Jute hessian Badekalinagar, Budge-Budge, Calcutta having their Office at 8 Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
41	CM/L-857 23-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Cheviot Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Jute sackings Badekalinagar, Budge-Budge, Calcutta having their office at 8 Clive Row, Calcutta-1.	IS: 1943-1964 Specification or A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
42	CM/L-858 23-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Auckland Jute Co. Ltd., Jute hessian Jagatdal, 24 Parganas having their Office at Chartered Bank Building, Calcutta-1.	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
43	CM/L-859 23-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Auckland Jute Co. Ltd., Jagat- dal, 24 Parganas having their Office at Chartered Bank Build- ing, Calcutta-1.	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill).
44	CM/L-860 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Dalhousie Jute Co. Ltd., Jute hessian Champdany, Distt. Hooghly having their Office at Chartered Bank Building, Calcutta-1.	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
45	CM/L-861 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Kinnison Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Jute hessian Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at Chartered Bank Building, Calcutta-1.	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
46	CM/L-862 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Kinnison Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at Chartered Bank Building, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
47	CM/L-865 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Northbrook Jute Co. Ltd., Champdany, Distt. Hooghly, having their Office at Chartered Bank Building, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	
48	CM/L-866 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Northbrook Jute Co. Ltd., Champdany, Distt. Hooghly having their Office at Chartered Bank Building Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
49	CM/L-868 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Union Jute Co. Ltd., 12 Convent Lane, Calcutta—15 having their Office at Chartered Bank Building, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
50	CM/L-869 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Gourepore Co. Ltd., Garifa, 24 Parganas having their Office at 2 Fairlie Place, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
51	CM/L-870 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Gourepore Co. Ltd., Garifa, 24 Parganas having their Office at 2 Fairlie Place, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks.



52	CM/L-871 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Nuddea Mills Co. Ltd., Naihati, 24 Parganas having their Office at 2 Fairlie Place, Calcutta-I	Jute hessian
53	CM/L-872 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Nuddea Mills Co. Ltd., Naihati, 24 Parganas having their Office at 2 Fairlie Place, Calcutta-I	Jute sackings
54	CM/L-883 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Hastings Mills Ltd., Rishra, Hooghly having their Office at 14 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I	Jute hessian
55	CM/L-884 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Hastings Mills Ltd., Rishra, Hooghly having their Office at 14 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I	Jute sackings
56	CM/L-885 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Fort William Co. Ltd., 47/48 Raj Narain Roychowdhury Ghat Road, Shibpore, Howrah having their Office at 14 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I	Jute hessian

IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised).  
IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool (L-twill) bags.

IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.

IS: 1942-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags (revised).

IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags.

IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks.

IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised).

IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.

IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.

IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags (revised).

IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags.

IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks.

IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised).

IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.

IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
57	CM/L-886 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Fort William Co. Ltd, 47/48, Raj Narain Roychowdhury Ghat Road, Shibpore, Howrah having their Office at 14, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
58	CM/L-887 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Khardah & Company Ltd, Titaghur, 24-Parganas having their Office at 7, Wellesley Place, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
59	CM/L-888 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Khardah & Company Ltd, Titaghur, 24-Parganas having their Office at 7, Wellesley Place, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
60	CM/L-889 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Megna Mills Co. Ltd., P.O. Jagatdal, 24-Parganas having their Office at 16, Strand Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
61	CM/L-890 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Megna Mills Co. Ltd., P.O. Jagatdal, 24-Parganas having their Office at 16, Strand Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.

62	CM/L-899 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Nakarpara Jute Co. Ltd., 220/2, Shibogopal Banerjee Le, Ghusuri, Howrah having their Office at 8, Dalhousie Square East, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
63	CM/L-900 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Nakarpara Jute Co. Ltd., 220/2, Shibogopal Banerjee Le, Ghusuri, Howrah having their Office at 8 Dalhousie Square East, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
64	CM/L-901 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Shree Ambica Jute Mills Ltd. P.O. Belurmah, Howrah having their Office at 23, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification f B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
65	CM/L-902 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Shree Ambica Jute Mills Ltd., P.O. Belurmah, Howrah having their Office at 23, Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification f B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
66	CM/L-905 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Caledonian Jute Mills Co. Ltd., 18, Mehta Road, Badekalinagar, Budge Budge, 24 Parganas having their Office at 9, Barbo- urne Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
67	CM/L-906 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s Caledonian Jute Mills Co Ltd., 18 Mehta Road, Badekalinagar, Budge Budge, 24 Parganas having their Office at 9, Brabou- rne Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.

(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
68 CM/L-907 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Calcutta Jute Mfg. Co. Ltd., 93, Narkeldanga Main Road, Calcutta-11 having their Office at 4, Dalhousie Square, Calcutta- 1.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
69 CM/L-908 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Calcutta Jute Mfg. Co. Ltd., 93, Narkeldanga Main Road, Calcutta-11 having their Office at 4, Dalhousie Square, Calcutta- 1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks.
70 CM/L-909 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Indian Jute Co. Ltd., P.S. Serampore, Hooghly having their Office at 16 Strand Road, Cal- cutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
71 CM/L-910 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The India Jute Co. Ltd., P.S. Serampore, Hooghly having their Office at 16, Strand Road, Cal- cutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
72 CM/L-913 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Bally Jute Co. Ltd., 58, Scott Kerr Road, Bally, Howrah hav- ing their Office at 15, India Ex- change Place, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS: 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
73 CM/L-914 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Bally Jute Co. Ltd., 5 Scott Kerr Road, Bally, Howrah hav- ing their Office at 15, India Ex- change Place, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS: 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS: 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS: 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS: 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.

74	CM/L-915 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Birla Jute Mfg. Co. Ltd., Birla- pur, 24-Parganas having their Office at 15, India Exchange Place, Calcutta-1	Jute hessian	IS : 2875-1964 Specification for Indian hessian
75	CM/L-916 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Birla Jute Mfg. Co. Ltd., Birla- pur, 24-Parganas having their Office at 15, India Exchange Place, Calcutta-1	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian
76	CM/L-919 28-11-64	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Nuhati Jute Mills Co. Ltd. P O Hazinagar, 24 Parganas having their Office at 33 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1	Jute hessian	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian
77	CM/L-920 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Nuhati Jute Mills Co. Ltd. P O Hazinagar, 24 Parganas having their Office at 33 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian
78	CM/L-921 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Fort Gloster Industries Ltd., (New Mill), P O Fort Gloster, Rly. Station Bauria, Distt. Howrah having their Office at 21 Strand Road Cal- cutta-1	Jute hessian	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags
79	CM/L-922 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Fort Gloster Industries Ltd., (New Mill) P O Fort Gloster, Rly. Station Bauria, District Howrah having their Office at 21, Strand Road, Calcutta-1	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags (revised). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
80	CM/L-923 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Fort Gloster Industries Ltd., (North Mill), P. O. Fort Gloster, Rly. Station Bauria, District Howrah having their Office at 21 Strand Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
81	CM/L-924 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Fort Gloster Industries Ltd., (North Mill), P. O. Fort Gloster, Rly. Station Bauria, District Howrah having their Office at 21 Strand Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 794-1966 Specification for for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
82	CM/L-925 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Hooghly Mills Co Ltd., 9 Garden Reach Road, Kidder- pore, Calcutta-43 having their Office at 10 Clive Row, Cal- cutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification fo Indian hessian.
83	CM/L-926 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Hooghly Mills Co. Ltd., 9 Garden Reach Road, Kidder- pore, Calcutta-43 having their Office at 10 Clive Row, Cal- cutta-1	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
84	CM/L-929 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Alexandra Jute Mills Ltd. Jagadai, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.

85	CM/L-930 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-II-68	M/s. Alexandra Jute Mills Ltd., Jagatdal, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
86	CM/L-931 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-II-68	M/s. Eastern Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Ali Hyder Road, Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
87	CM/L-932 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-II-68	M/s. Eastern Manufacturing Co. Ltd., Ali Hyder Road, Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
88	CM/L-933 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-II-68	M/s. Empire Jute Co. Ltd., Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
89	CM/L-934 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-II-68	M/s. Empire Jute Co. Ltd., Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags. IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
90	CM/L-935 28-II-1964	1-12-67	30-II-68	M/s. Kelvin Jute Co. Ltd., Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
91	CM/L-936 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Kelvin Jute Co. Ltd., Titaghur, 24 Parganas having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
92	CM/L-941 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. New Central Jute Mills Co. Ltd., (Albion Mills), Budge Budget, 24 Parganas having their Office at 11 Clive Row, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
93	CM/L-942 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. New Central Jute Mills Co. Ltd., (Albion Mills), Budge Budget, 24 Parganas having their Office at 11 Clive Row, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
94	CM/L-943 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. New Central Jute Mills Co. Ltd., (Lothian Mills), Budge Budget, 24 Parganas having their Office at 11 Clive Row, Calcutta-I.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
95	CM/L-944 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. New Central Jute Mills Co. Ltd., (Lothian Mills), Budge Budget, 24 Parganas having their Office at 11 Clive Row, Calcutta-I.	Jute sackings	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks.



96	CM L-945 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Ganges Mfg. Co. Ltd., Bansa-beria, Hooghly, having their Office at 11 Rabindra Sarani, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
97	CM L-946 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Ganges Mfg. Co. Ltd., Bansa-beria, Hooghly, having their Office at 11 Rabindra Sarani, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian  IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
98	CM L-947 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Agarpara Co. Ltd. P.O. Kamarhatta, 24 Parganas having their Office at 1 & 2 Old Court House Corner, Calcutta-1	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
99	CM L-948 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	The Agarpara Co. Ltd. P.O. Kamarhatta, 24 Parganas having their Office at 2 Old Court House Corner, Calcutta-1	Jute sackings.	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
100	CM L-949 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Shree Hanuman Jute Mills, 76 Jogendra Nath Mukherjee Road, Ghosuri, Howrah having their office at 8 Dalhousie Square East, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
101	CM/L-950 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Shree Hanuman Jute Mills, 76 Jogendra Nath Mukherjee Road, Ghusuri, Howrah having their Office at 8 Dalhousie Square East, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for Heavy Cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
102	CM/L-953 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Shree Mahadeo Jute Mills Co., 226 G. T. Road, Bally, Howrah having their Office at 46, Strand Road, Calcutta.	Jute hessian.	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
103	CM/L-954 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Shree Mahadeo Jute Mills Co., 226 G. T. Road, Bally Howrah having their Office at 46 Strand Road, Calcutta.	Jute sackings.	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
104	CM/L-963 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Naffar Chandra Jute Mills Ltd., Kankinarrah, 24 Parganas having their Office at 36 Strand Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	
105	CM/L-964 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Naffar Chander Jute Mills Ltd., Kankinarrah, 24 Parganas having their Office at 36 Strand Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags

106	CM/L-971 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Chitavalsah Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Chittavalsah, Visakhapatnam having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
107	CM/L-972 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Chitavalsah Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Chittavalsah, Visakhapatnam having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags
108	CM/L-973 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Nellimarla Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Nellimarla, Visakhapatnam having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute hessian.	IS : 2818-1964 Specification for Indian hessian.
109	CM/L-974 28-11-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Nellimarla Jute Mills Co. Ltd., Nellimarla Visakhapatnam having their Office at 3 Netaji Subhas Road, Calcutta-1.	Jute sackings.	IS : 1943-1964 Specification for A-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 2874-1964 Specification for heavy cee jute bags. IS : 2875-1964 Specification for jute corn sacks. IS : 2566-1965 Specification for B-twill jute bags ( <i>revised</i> ). IS : 3794-1966 Specification for Liverpool twill (L-twill) bags.
110	CM/L-975 30-11-1964	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Hindustan Chains Pvt. Ltd., G.T. Road, P.O. Pasaunda, Ghaziabad (U.P.)	Wrought aluminium utensils grade SIC.	IS : 21-1959 Specification for wrought aluminium and aluminium alloy for utensils ( <i>second revision</i> ).
111	CM/L-977 30-11-1964	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Industrial Research Corporation 2/70, East Mada Street, Thiruvanniyur, Madras-41.	Ferro-gallo tannate fountain pen ink (0.1 per cent iron content).	IS : 220-1959 Specification for ferro-gallo tannate fountain pen ink.
112	CM/L-978 2-12-1964	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Gladstone Lyall & Co. Ltd., 59 Kali Charan Ghosh Road, Sinthi, Calcutta-2 having their Regd. Office at 4 Fairlie Place, Calcutta-1.	Bitumen felts for waterproofing, type 3 grades 1 & 2.	IS : 1322-1965 Specification for bitumen felts for waterproofing and damp-proofing ( <i>revised</i> ).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
113	CM/L-980 21-12-1964	1-1-68	31-12-68	The Indian Cable Co. Ltd., Golmuri, Tatanagar having their Regd. Office at 9, Hare Street Calcutta-1.	PVC insulated (heavy duty) electric cables for working voltages up to and including 1 100 volts (with copper and aluminium conductors).	IS: 1554 (Part I)-1964 Specification for PVC insulated (heavy duty) electric cables for working voltages up to and including 1 100 volts ( <i>revised</i> ).
114	CM/L-981 21-12-1964	1-1-68	31-12-68	M's. Industrial Chemicals Ltd., Sankarnagar, Talaiyuthu R.S., Tirunelveli District having their Regd. Office at 175 'T. Mount Road, Madras-2.	Calcium carbide, technical, quality A.	IS: 1040-1960 Specification for calcium carbide, technical ( <i>revised</i> ).
115	CM/L-1123 12-8-1965	1-1-68	31-12-68	M s. General Engineering & Electric Works, 9, Dinoo Lane, Howrah.	Three-phase induction motors, 1 HP only.	IS 325-1961 Specification for three-phase induction motors ( <i>second revision</i> ).
116	CM/L-1124 12-8-1965	1-1-68	31-12-68	M s. General Engineering & Electric Works, 9, Dinoo Lane, Howrah.	Small AC electric motors with class 'A' insulation, 1 HP only, single phase, capacitor start.	IS: 996-1964 Specification for single phase small AC and universal electric motors ( <i>revised</i> ).
117	CM/L-1162 4-11-1965	1-1-68	31-12-68	M's. Prem Cables Pvt. Ltd. P.O. Pipaha-Kalan (Rajasthan).	Hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes.	IS: 398-1961 Specification for hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes ( <i>revised</i> ).
118	CM/L-1168 3-12-1965	1-1-68	31-12-68	M s. Prem Conductors Pvt. Ltd., Station Road, Vatva, Ahmedabad, Gujarat State	Hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes.	IS: 398-1961 Specification for hard-drawn standard aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes ( <i>revised</i> ).
119	CM/L-1169 3-12-1965	1-1-68	31-12-68	M s. Central Insecticides & Fertilizers, 110 Industrial Estate, Indore (M.P.)	DDT water dispersible powder concentrates.	IS: 565-1961 Specification for DDT water dispersible powder concentrates ( <i>revised</i> ).
120	CM/L-1170 6-12-1965	16-12-67	15-12-68	M's. Asmopol Engineering Co. C 16-17, Shri Ram Industrial Estate, Katrak Road, Wadala, Bombay-31.	Single-phase small AC and universal electric motors with class 'A' insulation up to 1/2HP only.	IS: 996-1964 Specification for single phase small AC and universal electric motors ( <i>revised</i> ).

	CM/L-1171 6-12-1965	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Power Cables Private Ltd., Vithalwadi, Kalvan.	Steel wire for the core of steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes	IS: 308-1961 Specification for hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes (revised).
122	CM/L-1173 7-12-1965	16-12-67	15-12-68	The Bharat Carbon & Ribbon Mfg. Co. Ltd., 543, Basantlal Sahi Road, P.O. New Alipore, Calcutta-13, having their Office at N-75, Bombay Life Building, Connaught Circus, New Delhi-1.	Carbon paper for typewriters type 1 without brand and type 3 with brand name mahal No. 2 and without brand.	IS: 1551-1959 Specification for carbon paper for typewriters
123	CM/L-1174 7-12-1965	16-12-67	15-12-68	A. S. Krishna Silicate & Glass Works Ltd., Baruipur, Post Office Baruipur, Distt. 24 Parganas having their office at 17 Radha Bazar Street, Calcutta-1.	Glass milk bottles.	IS: 1392-1959 Specification for glass milk bottles.
124	CM/L-1175 9-12-1965	1-1-67	31-12-68	M/s. Agromore Limited Mysore Road, Bangalore-26.	Liquid amine salts for 2, 4-D, agromore weeder 96 (bladex G) and agromore weeder 96 special (bladex G special) brands.	IS: 1827-1967 Specification for liquid amine salts of 2, 4-D.
125	CM/L-1178 13-12-1965	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Madhya Pradesh Industries, 31 Industrial Estate, P.O. Birla Nagar, Cwalior (M.P.).	Hard-drawn standardised aluminium conductors (AAC) for overhead power transmission purposes.	IS: 398-1961 Specification for hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes (revised).
126	CM/L-1182 15-12-1965	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Fort Gloster Industries Ltd. Bauria, S.B. Riv., having their Office at 31 Choringhee Road, Calcutta-16.	PVC insulated (heavy duty) electric cables for working voltages up to and including 1100 volts.	IS: 1554 (Part I)-1964 Specification for PVC insulated (heavy duty) electric cables for working voltages up to and including 1100 volts (revised).
127	CM/L-1183 16-12-1965	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Pesticides India, Udaipur, Road, Udaipur.	BHC emulsifiable concentrates.	IS: 632-1966 Specification for BHC emulsifiable concentrates (second revision).
128	CM/L-1185 17-12-1965	1-1-68	30-6-68	M/s. Grandlay Electricals (India), 456/426 Military Parade Road, Radio Colony, Delhi-9 having their office at 3/4 Asaf Ali Road, New Delhi-1.	Single core (unsheathed) PVC insulated cables with aluminium conductors, 250/440 volts and 650/1100 volts grades.	IS: 694 (Part II)-1964 Specification for PVC insulated cables for voltages up to 1100 volts with aluminium conductors (revised).

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
129	CM/L-1186 23-12-1965	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Indo-Engineering (Kota) Pvt. Ltd., Industrial Estate, Kota (Rajasthan)	Hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cored aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes	IS: 398-1961 Specification for hard-drawn stranded aluminium and steel-cord aluminium conductors for overhead power transmission purposes (revised)
130	CM/L-1339 29-9-1966	16-10-67	15-10-70	The Tata Iron and Steel Company Limited, Jamshedpur.	Hot rolled mild steel and medium tensile steel deformed bars for concrete reinforcement.	IS : 1139-1966 Specification for hot rolled mild steel and medium tensile steel deformed bars for concrete reinforcement (revised).
131	CM/L-1353 23-11-1966	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Kores (India) Ltd., Panchpakhadi Village, Hutatma Maruti Road Thana (West) having their office at Plot No. 10, Opp. Haines Road, Worli, Bombay-18.	Carbon paper for typewriters, type III.	IS : 1551-1959 Specification for carbon paper for typewriters.
132	CM/L-1356 30-11-1966	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Travancore Chemical and Mfg. Co. Ltd., Eloor, Udyogmandal, P.O., Via Alwaye, Kerala State having their Regd. Office at Kalamassery, Alwaye, Kerala State.	BHC water dispersible powder concentrates.	IS : 562-1962 Specification for BHC water dispersible powder concentrates.
133	CM/L-1361 30-11-1966	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Ankar Industries, Jessore Road, P.O. Madhyamgram, Distt. 24 Parganas.	DDT dusting powders.	IS : 564-1961 Specification for DDT dusting powders.
134	CM/L-1362 30-11-1966	1-12-67	30-11-68	M/s. Ankar Industries, Jessore Road, P.O. Madhyamgram, Distt. 24 Parganas.	DDT water dispersible powder concentrates.	IS : 565-1961 Specification for DDT water dispersible powder concentrates.

\*The period of validity of this licence was shown as '16-10-67 to 15-10-68' in notification published under number S.O. 4169 in the Gazette of India Part II—Section 3, sub-section (ii) dated 2nd December, 1967.

Sl. No.	CM/L-1351 12-12-1966	10-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Bombay Cable Co. Private Ltd., Agra Road, Bhandup, Bombay-78.	Type	Voltage grade	Conductor	IS : 694 (Part-1)-1964 Specification for PVC insulated cables (for Voltages upto 1100 Volts with aluminium conductors (revised).
					(a) PVC Insulated Cables:			
					(i) Single core (unsheathed)	250/440 &	Aluminium only.	
					(ii) Single core (PVC sheathed)	650/1100 volts		
					(iii) Flat twin with or without ECC (PVC sheathed).	650/1100 volts	Aluminium only	
136	CM/L-1365 14-12-1966	16-12-67	15-12-68	The Modi Torch Works, Modinagar, Distt. Meerut (U.P.).	Flashlights			IS : 2086-1963 Specification for flashlights.
137	CM/L-1366 16-12-1966	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Bramec Suri Private Ltd., G.T. Road, Ghaziabad having their Regd. office at 1655, S.P. Mukherjee Marg, Delhi-6.	Automotive brake lining Types I-A and I-B.			IS : 2742-1964 Specification for automotive brake lining.
138	CM/L-1367 16-12-66	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Emco General Industries, 6/1, Nawab D Iwarjung Road, Cossipore, Calcutta-2 having their office at P-16 New C.I.T. Road, Calcutta-12.	Low density polythene pipes for cold water services, normal and heavy gauge upto 50 mm size.			IS : 3076 (Part I)-1965 Specification for low density polythene pipes for cold water services upto 50 mm size.
139	CM/L-1368 16-12-1966	16-12-67	15-12-68	M/s. Metal Udyog Pvt. Ltd., Pattapnagar, Industrial Area, Udaipur (Rajasthan).	BHC dusting powders.			I : 561-1962 Specification for BHC dusting powders (second revision).
140	CM/L-1369 16-12-1966	16-12-67	15-12-68	The Western India Plywoods Ltd., P.O. Balapattam, Cannanore, Distt. Kerala State.	(i) Medium strength aircraft plywood, and (ii) Marine plywood.			(i) IS : 709-1957 Specification for medium strength aircraft plywood, and (ii) IS : 710-1957 Specification for marine plywood.

(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
141	CM/L-1370 26-12-1966	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Nahan Foundry Ltd., Nahan Distt. Sirmur (H.P.).	Horizontal centrifugal pumps for clear cold, fresh water (radial flow, single stage, single suction, volute casing, 76 mm×64mm (5 HP), 100mm×100mm (5 HP), 76 mm×64mm (3 HP) and 76mm×76mm (3 HP)).	IS : 1520-1960 Specification for horizontal centrifugal pumps for clear, cold, fresh water.
142	CM/L-1371 26-12-1966	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Hindustan Safety Glass Works Pvt. Ltd., Mahesh Muk- herjee Feeder Road, Ariadah, 24, Parganas, having their office at 7, Chittaranjan Avenue, Cal- cutta-13.	Laminated safety glass and heat- treated safety glass for land trans- port.	IS : 2553-1964 Specification for safety glass.
143	CM/L-1375 28-12-1966	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Sandoz (India) Limited, Kolshet Road, Thana having their office at 3 Wittet Road, Bombay-1.	Parathion emulsifiable concentrates	IS : 2129-1962 Specification for parathion emulsifiable concen- trates
144	CM/L-1380 30-12-1966	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Mahendra Electricals Limited Kamla Mission Road, Nadiad. Gujarat State.	(i) Single core cables with alumi- nium conductor;  (ii) Flat twin cables with or with- out earth continuity conductor, and (iii) Circular three-core cables with aluminium conductors.	IS : 1596-1962 Specification for polythene insulated and PVC sheathed cables.
145	CM/L-1382 30-12-1966	1-1-68	31-12-68	M/s. Camlin Private Ltd., Konda- vata, Near Marol Bazar, Andheri Kurla Road, Bombay-59, having their office at 210, Lady Jamshed- ji Road, Bombay-16.	Ink, duplicating, all weather black for rotary type machines.	IS : 1222-1957 Specification for ink, duplicating, weather, black for rotary type machines.

[No. MD/33: 16/A]



**S. O. 467.**—In pursuance of the provisions of sub-rule (2) of Rule 3 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks), Rules, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Indian Standards, particulars of which are given in the schedule thereto annexed, have been established during the quarter ending 31 December 1967.

**THE SCHEDULE**

S. No.	No. of Indian Standard	Title of Indian Standard
(1)	(2)	(3)
1	IS:6-1967	Specification for moderate heat duty fireclay refractories, Group 'A' ( <i>third revision</i> ).
2	IS:74-1966	Methods of sampling and test for drying oils for paints ( <i>first revision</i> ).
3	IS:170-1966	Specification for acetone ( <i>first revision</i> ).
4	IS:191-1967	Specification for copper ( <i>second revision</i> ).
5	IS:204-1966	Specification for tower bolts ( <i>second revision</i> ).
6	IS:258-1967	Specification for potash alum ( <i>first revision</i> ).
7	IS:380-1967	Specification for french chalk, technical ( <i>first revision</i> ).
8	IS:410-1967	Specification for rolled brass plate, sheet, strip and foil ( <i>second revision</i> ).
9	IS 422-1967	Specification for brass sheet and strip for the manufacture of utensils ( <i>first revision</i> ).
10	IS:537-1967	Specification for toluene, pure, nitration grade ( <i>first revision</i> ).
11	IS:550-1967	Specification for sales ( <i>first revision</i> ).
12	IS:796-1966	Glossary of cataloguing terms ( <i>first revision</i> ).
13	IS:802 (Part I)-1967	Code of practice for use of structural steel in overhead transmission-line towers Part I loads and permissible stresses.
14	IS 831-1966	Specification for badminton racket frames ( <i>revised</i> ).
15	IS:833-1967	Specification for rib-knitted gents' nylon stockings.
16	IS:1055-1957	Specification for arrowroot starch ( <i>first revision</i> ).
17	IS:1072-1967	Specification for leaf chains.
18	IS:1170-1967	Specification for ferrochromium ( <i>first revision</i> ).
19	IS:1181-1967	Qualifying tests for metal arc welders (engaged in welding structures other than pipes) ( <i>first revision</i> ).
20	IS:1182-1967	Recommended practice for radiographic examination of fusion welded butt joints in steel plates ( <i>first revision</i> ).
21	IS:1256-1967	Code of practice for building bylaws ( <i>first revision</i> ).
22	IS:1258-1967	Specification for bayonet lampholders ( <i>first revision</i> ).
23	IS:1378-1967	Specification for oxidized-copper finishes ( <i>first revision</i> ).
24	IS:1387-1967	General requirements for the supply of metallurgical materials ( <i>first revision</i> ).
25	*IS:1448	Indian standard methods of test for petroleum products.
26	IS:1506-1967	Specification for copper oxychloride dusting powder ( <i>first revision</i> ).
27	IS:1571-1967	Specification for aviation turbine fuels, kerosine type ( <i>second revision</i> ).
28	IS:1576-1967	Specification for solid pressboard for electrical purposes.
29	IS:1660-1967	Specification for wrought aluminium utensils ( <i>first revision</i> ).
30	IS:1726-1967	Specification for cast iron manhole covers and frames intended for use in drainage works ( <i>first revision</i> ).
31	IS:1851-1956	Specification for single operator type arc welding transformers ( <i>first revision</i> ).
32	IS:1875-1966	Specification for carbon steel billets blooms and slabs for forgings ( <i>revised</i> ).
33	IS 1885 (Part III/Sec.6)-1967	Electrotechnical vocabulary Part III acoustics Section 6 acoustical instruments.
34	IS:1885 [Part XIV]-1967	Electrotechnical vocabulary Part XIV nuclear power plants.

\*Individual methods of test are under revision to be maintained in a loose-leaf form binder.

(1)	(2)	(3)
35	IS:1885 (Part III/Sec 3)-1967	Electrotechnical vocabulary Part III acoustics. Section 3 sound recording and reproduction.
36	IS:2017-1967	Methods of chemical analysis of metallic manganese.
37	IS:2186-1967	Dimensions for external interference fit threads.
38	IS:2232-1967	Specification for slotted and castle nuts.
39	IS:2258-1967	Specification for rolled zinc plate, sheet and strip ( <i>first revision</i> ).
40	IS:2269-1967	Specification for hexagon socket head cap screws ( <i>first revision</i> ).
41	IS:2271-1967	Recommended method for spectrographic analysis of platinum.
42	IS:2429-1967	Specification for electric butt welded steel chain short link and pitched or calibrated, grade 30, for lifting purposes ( <i>first revision</i> ).
43	IS:2617-1967	Specification for mill-board, grayboard and strawboard ( <i>first revision</i> ).
44	IS:2879-1967	Specification for mild steel for metal arc welding electrode core wire ( <i>first revision</i> ).
45	IS:2974 (Part III)-1967	Code of practice for design and construction of machine foundations. Part III foundations for rotary type machines (reinforced concrete foundations for steam turbo generators).
46	IS:3035 (Part II)-1967	Specification for thermoplastic insulated weather proof cables. Part III polyethylene insulated and polyethylene sheathed.
47	IS:3156 (Part IV)-1967	Specification for voltage transformers Part IV capacitor voltage transformers.
48	IS:3347 (Part I/Sec 2)-1967	Dimensions for porcelain transformer bushings Part I upto 1.1 kV bushings. Section 2 metal parts.
49	IS:3347 (Part II/Sec. 2)-1967	Dimensions for porcelain transformer bushings Part II 3.6 kV bushings. Section 2 metal parts.
50	IS:3466-1967	Specification for masonry cement ( <i>first revision</i> ).
51	IS:3574 (Part II)-1966	Specification for organic pigments Part II phthalocyanines.
52	IS:3594-1967	Code of practice for fire safety of industrial buildings: general storage and warehousing including cold storages.
53	IS:3640-1967	Specification for hexagon fit bolts.
54	IS:3699 (Part II)-1967	Code for the transport of monkeys by land Part II transport from rail-head to the nearest airport.
55	IS:3753-1967	Methods of sampling for alcoholic drinks.
56	IS:3854-1966	Specification for switches for domestic and similar purposes.
57	IS:3914-1967	Code of practice for selection of ac induction motor starters (voltage not exceeding 1000 volts).
58	IS:3961 (Part I)-1967	Recommended current ratings for cables Part I paper-insulated lead-sheathed cables.
59	IS:3961 (Part II)-1967	Recommended current rating for cables Part II PVC insulated and PVC-sheathed heavy duty cables.
60	IS:4002-1967	General requirements and tests for audio frequency transformers and chokes used in transistorized equipment.
61	IS:4004-1967	Application guide for non-linear resistor type lighting arresters for alternating current systems.
62	IS:4008-1967	Guide for presentation of project report for river valley projects.
63	IS:4009-1967	Specification for grease nipples.
64	IS:4010-1967	Specification for sounding pipes.
65	IS:4015 (Part I)-1967	Guide for handling cases of pesticide poisoning Part I first-aid measures.
66	IS:4021-1967	Specification for timber door, window and ventilator frames.
67	IS:4035-1967	Specification for trolleys, stretcher.
68	IS:4036-1967	Specification for trolleys, patient.
69	IS:4037-1967	Specification for stretchers and stretcher carriers.

(1)	(2)	(3)
70	IS:4056-1966	Specification for fish oil for leather industry.
71	IS:4078-1967	Code of practice for indexing and storage of drill cores.
72	IS:4088-1967	Specification for <i>kusum</i> oil.
73	IS:4101 (Part I)-1967	Code of practice for external facing and veneers Part I stone facing.
74	IS:4101(Part II)-1967	Code of practice for external facing and veneers Part II cement concrete facing.
75	IS:4106-1967	Specification for bunting cloth, cotton khadi, dyed.
76	IS:4107-1967	Specification for blanketing cloth, wool khadi.
77	IS:4110-1967	Glossary of terms used in high vacuum technology.
78	IS:4114-1967	Coded markings of values of capacitance and resistance by letters and digits.
79	IS:4115-1967	Methods for sampling of oilseeds.
80	IS:4116-1967	Specification for wooden shelving cabinets (adjustable type).
81	IS:4117-1966	Specification for alcohol denaturants.
82	IS:4119-1967	Specification for charcoal-burning pressing irons.
83	IS:4120-1967	Specification for tubs and baths.
84	IS:4122-1967	Method of test for surface softening of natural building stones by exposure to acidic atmospheres.
85	IS:4126-1967	Specification for wooden wardrobes (adjustable and non-adjustable type).
86	IS:4127-1967	Code of practice for laying of glazed stoneware pipes.
87	IS:4140-1967	Specification for limestone for use in foundries.
88	IS:4141-1967	Specification for table tennis rackets.
89	IS:4145-1967	Code of practice for storage of ropes.
90	IS:4146-1967	Application guide for voltage transformers.
91	IS:4147-1967	Method of measurements on conventional receiving electronic valves.
92	IS:4151-1967	Specification for surgical rubber gloves.
93	IS:4153-1967	Specification for potassium chloride, technical.
94	IS:4152-1967	Specification for carbon dioxide cylinders for fire fighting purposes on boardship.
95	IS:4155-1966	Glossary of terms relating to chemical and radiation hazards and hazardous chemicals.
96	IS:4156-1967	Methods for sampling of barytes.
97	IS:4157 (Part I)-1967	Code for the transport of livestock Part I transport of equines (horses, mules and donkeys) by rail, road and sea.
98	IS:4162-1967	Specification for graduated pipettes.
99	IS:4164-1967	Specification for 'C' hooks for use with chains.
100	IS:4166-1967	Methods for sampling of ilmenite and rutile.
101	IS:4167-1967	Glossary of terms relating to air pollution.
102	IS:4168-1967	Method for wrapping test of aluminium and aluminium alloy wire.
103	IS:4169-1967	Method for calibration of elastic proving device.
104	IS:4170-1967	Specification for brass rods for general engineering purposes.
105	IS:4171-1967	Specification for copper rods for general engineering purposes.
106	IS:4173-1967	Specification for 4-methylaminophenol sulphate.
107	IS:4174-1967	Specification for typewriter ribbons.
108	IS:4175-1967	Specification for correcting fluid.
109	IS:4176-1967	Method for simple torsion test of aluminium and aluminium alloy wire.
110	IS:4177-1967	Method for flattening test of aluminium and aluminium alloy tubes.
111	IS:4178-1967	Specification for eye-nuts with collars.
112	IS:4179-1967	Sizes of process vessels and leading dimensions.
113	IS:4181-1967	Specification for feed fork for sewing machines for household purposes.
114	IS:4182-1967	Specification for misch metal.
115	IS:4185-1967	Specification for gummed paper tapes.
116	IS:4186-1967	Guide for preparation of project report for river valley projects.

(1)	(2)	(3)
117	IS: 4188-1967	Specification for oscillating shafts for sewing machines for household purposes.
118	IS: 4189-1967	Specification for firm-joint inside and outside calipers.
119	IS: 4190-1967	Specification for eyebolts with collars.
120	IS: 4192-1967	Specification for aluminium farm milk cooling tanks.
121	IS: 4193-1967	Specification for guar meal as livestock feed.
122	IS: 4194-1967	Specification for mustard and rape seed for propagation purposes.
123	IS: 4195-1967	Specification for wheat seed for propagation purposes.
124	IS: 4196-1967	Specification for maize seed for propagation purposes.
125	IS: 4197-1967	Specification for rice seed for propagation purposes.
126	IS: 4199-1967	Specification for liquid soap.
127	IS: 4200-1967	Specification for sodium aluminate.
128	IS: 4203-1967	Method for determination of sulphate content in textile materials.
129	IS: 4204-1967	Specification for drafting chairs.
130	IS: 4205-1967	Specification for drafting stools.
131	IS: 4208-1967	Specification for brush, stencil.
132	IS: 4209-1967	Code of safety for chemical laboratories.
133	IS: 4210-1967	Specification for strip feeler gauges for electrical purposes.
134	IS: 4212-1967	Specification for drafting tables and reference tables for drawing offices.
135	IS: 4213-1967	Specification for vernier depth gauges.
136	IS: 4214-1967	Specification for brushes, boiler tube (without shank).
137	IS: 4215-1967	Specification for needle bearings.
138	IS: 4221-1967	Quality tolerances for water for tanning industry.
139	IS: 4222-1967	Specification for coloured chalks, moulded.
140	IS: 4223-1967	Specification for steel wire for umbrella ribs.
141	IS: 4224-1967	Specification for steel wire for office staples.
142	IS: 4225-1967	Recommended practice for ultrasonic testing of steel plates.
143	IS: 4226-1967	Code of practice for fire safety of industrial buildings & aluminium powder factories.
144	IS: 4227-1967	Specification for braided nylon cored for aeronautical purposes.
145	IS: 4228-1967	Specification for nylon tapes for aeronautical purposes.
146	IS: 4229-1967	Specification for nylon sewing threads for aeronautical purposes.
147	IS: 4230-1967	Specification for lock, lever tumbler type.
148	IS: 4231-1967	Specification for locks, miller type.
149	IS: 4232-1967	Specification for turnip.
150	IS: 4233-1967	Specification for beets.
151	IS: 4234-1967	Specification for sweet potato.
152	IS: 4235-1967	Specification for chillies, fresh.
153	IS: 4236-1967	Specification for glyceryl monostearate for cosmetic industry.
154	IS: 4237-1967	General requirements for switchgear and controlgear for voltages not exceeding 1000 volts.
155	IS: 4238-1967	Specification for sterilized milk.
156	IS: 4239-1967	Specification for bevel protractors.
157	IS: 4241-1967	Specification for engineers' parallels.
158	IS: 4242-1967	Method of measurement of acoustical noise emitted by ballasts for gaseous discharge lamps.
159	IS: 4243-1967	Specification for mandarins.
160	IS: 4244-1967	Specification for retractors, skin, double ended.
161	IS: 4245-1967	Specification for needle holder (gillies) combined with scissors, for plastic surgery.
162	IS: 4247 (Part-1)—1967	Code of practice for structural design of surface hydel power stations Part I data for design.
163	IS: 4248-1967	Specification for non-ignitable and self-extinguishing boards (with mineral base) for electrical purposes.
164	IS: 4250-1967	Specification for domestic electric food-mixers (liquidizers, blenders and grinders).
165	IS: 4251-1967	Quality tolerances for water for processed food industry.
166	IS: 4252-1967	Specification for electroplated coatings of gold for decorative purposes.

(1)	(2)	(3)
167	IS: 4253 (Part-I)—1967	Specification for cork composition sheets Part I plain cork.
168	IS: 4254-1967	Specification for jaw crushers.
169	IS: 4255-1967	Specification for gyratory and cone crushers.
170	IS: 4256-1967	Specification for hydrated calcium sulphate from marine brine.
171	IS: 4257-1967	Dimensions for clamping arrangements for bushings
172	IS: 4259-1967	Code of practice for erection and calibration of direction-finders (medium frequency) for marine use.
173	IS: 4260-1967	Recommended practice for ultrasonic testing of welds in ferritic steel.
174	IS: 4261-1967	Glossary of terms relating to paper and pulp-based packaging materials.
175	IS: 4262-1967	Code of safety for sulphuric acid.
176	IS: 4263-1967	Code of safety for chlorine.
177	IS: 4264-1967	Code of safety for caustic soda.
178	IS: 4265-1967	Specification for 4-4' dia minostilbene 2-2' disulphonic acid.
179	IS: 4266-1967	Specification for lockers, bedside for hospital use.
180	IS: 4267-1967	Specification for stands, wash hand basin.
181	IS: 4268-1967	Specification for air depolarized primary wet cells.
182	IS: 4269-1967	Specification for dextrin for use in foundries.
183	IS: 4270-1967	Specification for steel tubes used for water wells.
184	IS: 4271-1967	Specification for coumarin.
185	IS: 4272-1967	Specification for vanillin.
186	IS: 4273-1967	Specification for isobornyl acetate.
187	IS: 4275-1967	Specification for scissors, kilner's for plastic surgery.
188	IS: 4276-1967	Specification for solvent-extracted soybean oil, refined.
189	IS: 4277-1967	Specification for solvent-extracted sunflower oil, refined.
190	IS: 4278-1967	Dimensions for speedometer cables.
191	IS: 4279-1967	Dimensions for bent strap clamps.
192	IS: 4280-1967	Specification for refined secondary tin.
193	IS: 4282-1967	Specification for forceps, dissecting, plastic surgery.
194	IS: 4283-1967	Specification for hot air fan.
195	IS: 4284-1967	Method for volumetric determination of iron.
196	IS: 4285-1967	Method for volumetric determination of calcium.
197	IS: 4286-1967	Specification for processed solid smokeless domestic fuel.
198	IS: 4287-1967	Glossary of terms relating to starch.
199	IS: 4289-1967	Specification for lift cables.
200	IS: 4291-1967	Dimensions for C-washers.
201	IS: 4292-1967	Dimensions for strap clamps.
202	IS: 4293-1967	Dimensions for Ustrap clamps
203	IS: 4294-1967	Dimensions for jig buttons.
204	IS: 4295-1967	Dimensions for locking dogs (catches).
205	IS: 4296-1967	Dimensions for round piercing punches.
206	IS: 4297-1967	Dimensions for spherical washers and conical seats.
207	IS: 4298-1967	Dimensions for swing C-washers
208	IS: 4299-1967	Dimensions for jig feet.
209	IS: 4300-1967	Specification for box pallets for through transit of goods.
210	IS: 4302-1967	Specification for dry-salted mackerel.
211	IS: 4303 (Part-I)—1967	Code for sanitary conditions, handling and transport in fish industry Part—I pre-processing stage.
212	S: 4303 (Part-II)—1967	Code for sanitary conditions, handling and transport in fish industry Part—II sanitary conditions for fish processing units.
213	IS: 4305-1967	Glossary of terms relating to pozzolana.
214	IS: 4306-1967	Specification for hexamethylenetetramine (hexamine).
215	IS: 4307-1967	Specification for fish meal as livestock feed.
216	IS: 4310-1967	Specification for weldable steel pipe fittings for marine purposes.
217	IS: 4315-1967	Specification for pliers, bar bending, dental.
218	IS: 4316-1967	Specification for pliers, snipe nose, dental.

[No. MD/13:3]

DR. SADGOPAL,  
Deputy Director General.

